Draft v2.0.0 N5-030307

joint-API-group (Parlay, ETSI Project OSA, 3GPP TSG_CN WG5)
DRAFT Report of Meeting #24, San Francisco, USA, 14-18 July 2003

Contents

Chair: Chelo Abarca (Alcatel)
Vice-Chair: Musa Unmehopa (Lucent Technologies)
3GPP Support: Adrian Zoicas (ETSI, 3GPP Mobile Competence Centre) - Absent for the 2nd consecutive time. Reason: overlap with 3GPP SA5 meetings.
Meeting Host: 3GPP2
Web Home Page: http://www.3gpp.org/TB/CN/CN5/CN5.htm
3GPP E-mail Lists: http://www.3gpp.org/email/lists.htm http://list.etsi.org/
JWG E-mail List: 3GPP_TSG_CN_WG5_JOINTAPIWORK@LIST.ETSI.ORG
Server: http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_cn/WG5_osa/ ftp://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_cn/WG5_osa/

1 Opening of the meeting and approval of the agenda (Monday 9:00 AM)

N5-030371	List of REGISTERED participants	MCC	1 Agenda approval	Tdoc	Noted.

12 delegates attended the meeting. The list of participants can be found in Annex C. Additionally, some JWG members attended the meeting via telephone conference bridge for specific agenda items:

IBM EUROPE (ETSI)	Scott BROUSSARD	(+1 512 257-2431 scottjb@us.ibm.com)
Incomit (ETSI)	Anders LUNDQVIST	(+46 54 17 67 03 anders.lundqvist@incomit.com)
Lucent Technologies (T1)	Shehryar QUTUB	(+1 630 224 2910, squtub@lucent.com)
Lucent Technologies (T1)	Bharat KUMAR	(+1 908 582 5487, bharat@lucent.com)

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030300	Draft Agenda	JWG Chair	1 Agenda approval	Agenda	Approved.

The draft agenda proposed by the Chair was approved without modification and can be found in Annex A.

1.1 IPR (Intellectual Property Rights) declarations

The Chair reminded the "Article 55: Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) Policy" of the 3GPP Working Procedures:

- Individual Members shall be bound by the IPR Policy of their respective Organizational Partner.
- Individual Members should declare at the earliest opportunity, any IPRs, which they believe to be essential, or potentially essential, to any work ongoing within 3GPP.
- Organizational Partners should encourage their respective members to grant licences on fair, reasonable terms and conditions and on a non-discriminatory basis.
- The PCG shall maintain a register of IPR declarations relevant to 3GPP, received by the Organizational Partners.

The Chair invited the delegates to declare IPRs - relevant to the 3GPP - they are aware of and there were no declarations received. The List of IPR declarations sorted by Organizational Partners can be found at: http://www.3gpp.org/legal/legal.htm

2 Allocation of documents to agenda items

New documents were registered. More discipline was again requested for submitting meeting contributions at least five (5) working days before the respective meeting starts. The list of meeting documents can be found in Annex B.

The continuously updated CN5 Document List can be found at http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_cn/WG5_osa/N5DocLst.zip

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030301	Document Allocation	JWG Chair	2 Tdoc# allocation	Tdoc	Noted.

Added
- Tdocs 212-22
- Tdocs 379, 373, 374

Tdoc allocation format has been changed to make a more readable report.
Ultan: this is a typical format for a report; usually the Tdoc allocation uses a colour code in order to know the status of the document; it's also used for the chair notes, while MCC does the report. This is not the case in this group, where the chair is writing the report herself.
Conclusion: we keep the new format and Ultan will keep track of doc status with the doc list.

3 Reporting

3.1 JWG meeting, San Diego

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030107	Draft Report of CN5#23, San Diego, USA, 19-23 May 2003	JWG Chair	3. Reporting	Report	Approved without change
N5-030108	Report of CN5#23, San Diego, CA, USA, 19-23 May 2003	JWG	3. Reporting	Report	Approved

3.2 3GPP

3.2.1 CN plenary

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030309	Report of last 3GPP CN meeting	CN Chair	3 Reporting	Report	Noted.

- Release 5 has gone into "deep freeze".
- Our proposal to include the Java realization for the APIs approved, starting in Rel5.
- CN presented the following JWG related issues to the last SA plenary:
  - The OSA Rel6 requirements Retrieval of Visited Network Capabilities and Enhanced User Privacy in LCS will be deleted at CN#21 if there is no activity by September
  - There is a risk of slippage of User Data Management Function, since this OSA Rel6 requirement is awaiting SA2 guidanceCN also requested from SA to use more clear names for WIDs (avoiding "enhancements on xx", as ours is called, because it's not very descriptive.
- CN's opinion on 3GPP and OMA overlap:
  - 3GPP should have responsibility for the IMS platformOrganizations such as OMA would use that 3GPP IMS platform to develop their service enablersCoordination with IETF (related to IMS) should be via 3GPPThere is a need to document the technical interfaces between 3GPP and OMA (meaning that the work split should be clearly defined)
  - There is a need to document the procedural mechanisms for interworking between 3GPP and OMA
    - How does OMA put requirements on 3GPP?CN has no intention to produce any new specification for OMA – OMA are invited to use existing and ongoing specs.CN need our feedback on meeting calendar.

Q: how is it decided when a release is frozen?
A: between six to nine months since the specifications are presented. It is a decision to say that implementations can start.

Concern that it could be too early for freezing Rel5, although the JWG is in a better shape – although concern that there is no feedback from Rel5 implementations.

Noted.

3.2.2 SA plenary

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030310	Report of last 3GPP SA meeting	MCC	3 Reporting	Report	Noted.
N5-030310r1	Report of last 3GPP SA meeting v004	MCC	3 Reporting	Report	Noted.

The way this report describes the status of SA1 OSA was very misleading, and after a proposal from the CN5 chair it has been changed to the following text:

"The TSG CN Chairman reported that no progress had been made in 6 months for the following features: Generic Network interface function, Information transfer feature and Information services feature. It can, therefore, be concluded that there is no interest in these features from the OSA community. In line with the SA discussions in Biarritz, after 6 months monitoring showing no interest, these requirements have been removed from the OSA stage 1 specification."

Our LS on User Data Management requirements was presented to SA by the CN chairman and noted (no comments in the report).

March 2004 has been taken as an assumed goal for the Rel-6 Functional Freezing date. No new Requirements should be presented after September 2003 to allow the Stage 2 to be completed in December 2003 and Stage 3 by March 2004 – which is already considered an ambitious timescale for the work.

OMA interactions were discussed **in a 3GPP context** (as stressed by the SA chair). The following points were raised:

- There was a suggestion that OMA are asked to provide a list of their Work which has a dependency on 3GPP work, so 3GPP can provide the expected timescales.
- It was suggested that the 3GPP work items should be marked and identified where they are common with OMA Work, as the responsibility of Member Companies belonging to both Groups, not 3GPP as a body. If, e.g. 3GPP wish to create a Stage 3 of a feature and it is suggested that OMA are working on a Stage 1 and 2, then 3GPP would investigate this to ensure the scope and timescales are adequate for our needs.
- It was suggested that 3GPP should not consider changing their processes unless a clear advantage can be identified.
- Care should be taken, in case there are differences in the content of similar-looking Work Items between OMA and 3GPP, to ensure that both bodies produce the necessary specifications for each other.
- Joint working with OMA was not considered necessary as a principle, but it was recognised that certain experts may need to meet together to be determined on a case-by-case basis.

Agreements on this subject:

- A workshop will be organized between 3GPP and OMA (see Tdoc 315)
- OMA should be asked to inform 3GPP what their expectations are of 3GPP.
- Iain Sharpe to draft a dependency list.

Noted.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030311	SA1 report to SA#20	SA1	3 Reporting	Report	Noted.

- The WID was revised in line with the recommendation from the stage 2 and elements for which no work was carried out in the past meetings have been removed - Generic Network interface function, Information transfer feature and Information services feature.
- Contrary to the wish of SA2, SA1 will keep the IP session control API in the stage 1 at least for the time being.

Noted.

3.2.3 SA1 activities on OSA Requirements

3.2.4 SA1 and T2 activities on MMS

3.2.5 SA2 activities on IP Session Function

3.2.6 SA2 activities on User Data Management

3.2.7 CN1 activities on Access Independence and Presence

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030373	Report on status of Access Independence and Presence work in CN1	Marconi Communications	3 Reporting	Report	Noted

Access independence: no activity, input from SA2 is still awaited.

Presence: lots of requirements from SA2 received, now being worked as SIP enhancements.

Still a lot of work to be done:

- Work heavily dependent on IETF work. 3GPP requirements are being transformed into very technical protocol requirements for IETF.
- There were 51 open issues on the CN1 presence report in the May meeting, 30 of them have not been addressed yet.

No protocol has been selected yet for the Ut interface. There is a preference at the moment to use XCAP (specified by IETF, it is basically XLM transported over HTPP), though there may be more than one. The figure in Tdoc 373 (from the author, not from CN1) shows how this functionality can be supported by an IMS AS or the OSA GW (as the network side of the Ut interface), and not the IMSSF (in line with CAMEL not being enhanced to support IMS functionality; a CR has been agreed to the IMS specification so that CAMEL does not appear in the context of the Ut interface).

See 398 – a contribution on PAM mapping.

Noted.

3.2.8 3GPP Future Evolution Workshop

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030314	TR 21.902 V1.1.01(2003-06) Evolution of 3GPP System	future evolution workshop at SA#20	3 Reporting	Tdoc	Noted.

This is the last version of the TR prepared by the SA Future Evolution Workshop, 3GPP TR 21.902 V1.1, “3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects; Evolution of 3GPP System; (Release X)”, that has undergone some big structural changes and was agreed to be distributed in the SA list. No direct impact for us, just for information.

Noted.

3.2.9 3GPP / OMA discussions

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030326	OMA Dependencies - for 3GPP WG review	MCC	3 Reporting	Tdoc	Noted.

See Tdoc 310r1 – This is the result of an action point at SA#20 to prepare a list of 3GPP dependencies on OMA deliverables. This is the first draft, for review and updating by the WGs.

The objective of this is to collect a list of points where it has been agreed that 3GPP will use OMA documents. This first draft is based on our own input – from the different WGs; ours was prepared in the San Diego meeting. Working groups are requested to review it and give feedback, especially on the following points:

- For items listed is it the agreed position that 3GPP has the dependency identified?
- Are there any missing items where there is an agreed dependency?
- Is there additional information that should be captured?

A first comment has already been made/ the OSA part seems to be missing, as seem to be others like Presence and IMS - this has already been pointed out in the Leaders list, and the reply was a stress that this document collects *agreed* dependencies, and the rest of the items listed in the previous Dependencies document are still under discussion.

This is supposed to be equivalent to the IETF dependencies table. The feeling of the meeting is that there are no dependencies in the case of OSA, but that we should go back to the overlap discussion.

Conclusions (for the CN plenary):

- we have no dependencies
- we'd like more work on the overlap

After the September WS it will be clearer what is to be done with the overlaps, and we can discuss this again.

Noted.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030315	3GPP-OMA Workshop, 15th September 2003	MCC	3 Reporting	Tdoc	Noted.

See Tdoc 310r1 – A Workshop between 3GPP and OMA has been organized on Monday 15 Sep 2003 in Frankfurt (just before September plenaries). Delegates can register as 3GPP or OMA (there is room for 100 of each).

Chelo and Jane are planning to participate.

Noted.

3.3 Parlay

Liaison with PayCircle is causing some problems to some companies. The idea is the PC companies meet jointly with Parlay to work on the Payment part of Parlay X 2.0, and also changes to version 1.

There are IPR issues associated with the Parlay X doc and the PayCircle IPR statements there, and in relation with ETSI and 3GPP – whether they will allow these statements in the specs. This will be discussed in the Parlay X session of the agenda.

Parlay has also established a liaison with MSF – they have a layered architecture where Parlay can fit (between service layer and application). They have agreed to jointly work with Parlay in that area, and use Parlay. The legal part of the liaison has not been finalized yet. They would like to have Parlay attending an interoperability event, date probably September.

For more information about the MSF see the presentation that they gave in the last Parlay member meeting. They don't write specifications, so they could use Parlay's. The practicalities of the liaison have not been discussed yet – there is the suggestion that maybe MSF delegates could attend some parts of Parlay meetings signing an NDA.

PAM Forum: nothing new to report.

Liaison with OMA: Parlay delegates will be able to attend OMA meetings specifically dealing with Parlay coordination issues – possibly Architecture or Mobile Web Service meetings, not sure but it seems that Parlay non-OMA members may only attend the Parlay related parts. Note that OMA meeting dates and agendas are not public, Richard to find out if it is Frank (Parlay liaison officer) the person to contact by Parlay companies.

A new TAC working group (separate from the current TAC that manages the rest of the Parlay WGs) will be created next meeting where members can discuss both technical and organizational issues (including liaisons). This group will be chaired by Richard and will meet during the member meetings.

The Parlay Board has been expanded with two new board seats, final vote not available yet.

Next Parlay meeting is proposed November 3-6, waiting for the JWG management to give feedback. This will be discussed in the Future Meetings agenda item of this meeting.

3.4 ETSI

3.4.1 ETSI SPAN reorganization

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030328	ETSI: CL 2262 - The new Technical Committee formed by the combination of TC SPAN and EP TIPHON	ETSI	3 Reporting	Tdoc	Noted.

SPAN and TIPHON have formed officially a single group, whose management is now under discussion. Mike Briggs (SPAN chair) is not running for the chair of this new TB, nor is the TIPHON chair. Tdoc 328 is a call for candidates.

There is a new OSA Project set up in the new TB, no major impact to be expected for the JWG except that our work could have a bigger visibility. ETSI WI numbers will change.

Noted.

3.4.2 STF 211

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030325	ETSI: CL 2258 - Call for Experts for Specialist Task Force MN (ETSI/SPAN) on Conformance Test Specifications to Support the API for Open Service Access Version 2	ETSI	3 Reporting	Tdoc	Noted.

STF 211 finished at the end of 2002. Budget to continue it has been allocated by ETSI in June 2003. Tdoc 325 is the call for experts on these activities. Sine STF 211 was stopped, a new STF needs to be created, and positions are open for everybody – even the previous STF 211 experts will have to re-apply.

The work of this STF will include now the Application side.

Budget will allow 8 man months, most allocated in June 2003, rest to be allocated in January 2004. Work expected to continue until March 2004.

For further details see Tdoc 325 or contact Ultan.

Noted.

3.5 3GPP2

Roger reminds of invitation to the TSG-X team building on Wednesday night, starting at 4:45 pm at the Hyatt Embarcadero. A cable car day pass will be offered to delegates and spouses, and a visit to the cable car Museum (that closes at 6pm). Later a self-paid dinner, details will be provided tomorrow.

3GPP2 OSA has a meeting tomorrow at 9:30 to 12 tomorrow, during the JWG FW session. 3GPP2 delegates will be meeting briefly and join us later.

Telephone and bridge for delegates who requested to call in this meeting will be available; Musa will be given the details.

3.6 Work between meetings

This agenda item aims to review the ToDo list from the previous meeting, plus reporting on any other between-meetings activity, if applicable.

Not applicable this time (there was no ToDo list).

3.7 Other reporting

No other reporting.

4 Input liaison statements

No input LSs for this meeting.

5 Technical discussions OSA version 1 / 3GPP Rel.4

Only essential error corrections can be taken into account. Essential means that without the intended error correction the current spec cannot be implemented (SCS and/or application side).

Note that as Parlay 3.2 has been finalised, and backwards compatibility has to be guaranteed, the assumption is that for error corrections in the scope of Parlay 3 / 3GPP Rel.4 only work around and documentation of the errors is allowed.

NOTE: No Rel-4 CR agreed by CN5 will be submitted to the next CN plenary (CN#21, Sep 2003).

The below CRs belong to a package, all the same change: 345 (Rel4, CC), 346 (Rel4, MMCC), 348 (Rel5, GCC), 349 (Rel5, MPCC)and 350 (Rel5, MMCC).

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030345	Rel 4 CR 29.198-04 - update incorrect superviseRes description	Gareth Carroll, Open API Solutions	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed.
N5-030346	Update incorrect MMCC superviseCallRes description	Gareth Carroll, Open API Solutions	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	Tdoc	Approved.
N5-030348	Rel 5 CR 29.198-04-2 - update incorrect GCC superviseCallRes description	Gareth Carroll, Open API Solutions	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed. Needs CR Cat A.
N5-030349	Rel 5 CR 29.198-04-3 - update incorrect MPCC superviseCallRes description	Gareth Carroll, Open API Solutions	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed. Needs CR Cat A.
N5-030350	Rel 5 CR 29.198-04-4 - update incorrect MMCC superviseVolumeRes description	Gareth Carroll, Open API Solutions	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed. Needs CR Cat A.

The descriptions of superviseRes and superviseCallRes are incorrect. They state that the method "… is invoked as a response to the request also when a tariff switch happens in the network during an active call." There is no appropriate value in TpCallSuperviseReport to indicate any tariff change, only to indicate that the supervision timer has expired, the call has ended, a warning tone has been applied, or UI has completed. The corresponding supervise*Req methods also do not mention tariff change notification.

This contribution proposes that the text in superviseRes and superviseCallRes that references tariff changes should be removed. This is easier than introducing a new value into TpCallSuperviseReport and makes the supervise*Res correspond closer to the description given in supervise*Req. Failure to remove this incorrect statement could lead to implementations invoking superviseRes with an inappropriate and irrelevant value simply because a tariff has changed in the network and there is no appropriate value to use.

The functionality isn't there – it is just the description that says so. Since Rel4 is frozen we cannot add functionality, so the only way to correct this mismatch is to delete this description. Contributions adding this functionality are welcome for Rel6 if there is an interest.

Some errors to be corrected in the CR front page.

Approved.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030347	Update incorrect MMCC method references	Gareth Carroll, Open API Solutions	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	Tdoc	Agreed. Rel-5 Mirror CR in 351.
N5-030351	Rel 5 CR 29.198-04-4 - update incorrect MMCC method references	Gareth Carroll, Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Agreed. Rel-5 Mirror CR of 347.

N5-030347 is Not a 3GPP CR.

There are a number of incorrect method references in the Multi-media call control specification. Sequence diagram 4.4 references routeReq which no longer exists on IpMultiPartyCall, and routeRes, which no longer exists on IpAppMultiPartyCall.

This contribution proposes to correct the incorrect method references. Consequences if not Approved: failure to correct these method references can lead to confusion and, potentially, incorrect and non-interoperable implementations.

Approved.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030353	Discuss MMCC criteria overlap and activity timer text	Gareth Carroll, Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Rejected.

Not a 3GPP CR.

A number of changes have been made to clarify the nature of the behaviour to be expected in the case of criteria overlap and also the activity timer in Multi Media Call Control. Not all of these changes have made it through to MMCC, and this contribution asks the group to discuss whether there is a benefit in adding them. If the group feels that there is, then Open API Solutions may be able to produce contributions to add the necessary text.

Comment: we need to work on notifications in the MultiMedia context, including clarifications.

Comment: ES202915-4-4 is the Rel5 ETSI specification, not the one for Rel5 as in the document header. Rel5 MMCC is under change control, but Rel4 is not, which means that for Rel4 there is more freedom to make changes. Not clear to the meeting whether this is one case where Rel5 has already been corrected but Rel4 hasn't.

If this contribution is just asking for agreement to present contributions on this subject, the meeting agrees contributions are encouraged within the limits allowed by the frozen status of releases 4 and 5.

Ultan to ask Gareth for clarification, inform the group by email.

Rejected.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030372	Inconsistency with the definition of UserInteractionAborted	Marconi Communications	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	Tdoc	Agreed. Results in 2 Rel 4/5 CRs: 391, 392
N5-030391	Inconsistency with the definition of UserInteractionAborted	Marconi Communications	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	For email approval.
N5-030392	Inconsistency with the definition of UserInteractionAborted	Marconi Communications	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	For email approval.

Not a 3GPP CR.

The purpose of this discussion document is to seek the views of the meeting with regards a solution proposed to adopt to resolve an inconsistency have identified in the specification for Release 4 User Interaction (TS 29.198-5). The authors believe that this also applies to all previous and subsequent releases of User Interaction.

The IPAppUIManager userInteractionAborted method is called to indicate that the User Interaction service instance has terminated or closed abnormally. It has a TpUIIdentifer parameter that has the UIRef for the UI Object and a UserInteractionSessionId. Consider the scenario where the createUICall method is used, a UICall object and UICallRef are created. There is no separate UI object, the UICall class inherits from the UI class but the latter is never instantiated as an object (i.e. only the former is instantiated). During the processing an error is detected which results in the dialogue being aborted using the userInteractionAborted method. As indicated before the TpUIIdentifier does not contain a UICallRef only a UIRef is specified but for the scenario described there is no UIRef only a UICallRef therefore how should this parameter be populated?

This scenario highlights an inconsistency that should be corrected. There are 4 options to consider:

1. Create a new method for use with UICall e.g. userInteractionCallAborted
2. Redefine an existing parameter to carry the UICallRef
3. Add a new parameter to the existing method userInteractionAborted
4. Remove the requirement to specify UIRef and just provide a UserInteractionSessionId in the TpUIIdentifier

Regardless of the option chosen, as this inconsistency has been in the specifications from the beginning the ideal would be to correct all versions however this is not practical in view of the 3GPP rules for changing frozen releases. Therefore as an immediate solution Marconi proposes to use option 2 and assign the UICallRef into the UIRef parameter, believing that this is

a valid approach due to the inheritance relationship although perhaps not strictly correct. Marconi is aware of at least one other implementation that has adopted this workaround.

The problem which now arises is how and in which release should this workaround be described? Also, agreement on a solution for the long term is required for future releases.

Q: but the UICall object is derived from the UI object?

A: this doesn't mean that having the ref for one means having the ref for the other.

Comment: isn't this the normal behaviour – like MPCC objects in the context of MMCC, where there is a similar inheritance relationship? This is highlighting a broader problem – this is not the only instance of inheritance relationship and the corresponding references. A general explanation could be included in Part 2, where the interface reference type is defined. This proposal would satisfy Marconi.

Conclusion: Marconi will prepare a CR to Part 2, for Rel5 and Rel4 since this inconsistency may cause interoperability problems. No need to a Rel6 CR since we haven't generated Rel6 Part 2 yet.

Will be numbers 391, 392, for email approval.

Noted.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030374	The different values of TpReleaseCause between MPCC and GCC	NTT (Atsushi Iwasaki)	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4, OSA2 3GPP Rel-5, OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.

The current specification had defined different values for TpReleaseCause between GCC (showed examples from ITU-T Q.850 Cause) and MPCC (defined 13 values which are network independent.)

Considering the situation which current applications or gateways had supported GCC would be migrated to MPCC, because Q.850 has over 30 causes, there would be the difference of implementation between vendors. As this information of release cause is important for applications or operators to get CDR and execute error handling, some guideline (to specify the recommended mapping between Q.850 and TpreleaseCause (13 values) in the MPCC) should be needed in MPCC. This contribution asks the group if this kind of guideline is necessary.

Comment: agreed this is a problem, some companies have developed their own internal mapping and have had problems interpreting each of the release causes. Marconi proposes to share this information and generate a joint contribution to address this.

Question: this is a different philosophy to the network agnosticism in our specifications.

Answer: true, this should belong to the mapping document, but it is general for circuit switch, not a mapping for a specific protocol. This would be informative information.

Discussion about the mapping documents: we didn't do all we intended and it seems we cannot commit to do them.

Comment: there was a deliberate intention to move from Q.850, partly because in certain contexts some of these values were not easy to explain to application developers not telecom experts – the idea was to move to more abstract values.
Comment: that doesn't exclude mapping for those who know.

The meeting aggress this is important information, and informative. The question is where to put it – in the specifications, in the mapping document?

Conclusion: the issue raised in this contribution is agreed. Contributions are welcome proposing solutions.

Noted.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030375	Rel 4 CR 29.198-12 Charging State Correction	AePONA	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Updated to 394
N5-030376	Rel 5 CR 29.198-12 Charging State Correction	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Updated to 395
N5-030394	Rel 4 CR 29.198-12 Correction of Charging State transition	AePONA	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed.
N5-030395	Rel 5 CR 29.198-12 Correction of Charging State transition	AePONA	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed.

These contributions are a consequence of a contribution to San Diego. There was some ambiguity in the San Diego report about what we had agreed. This has been discussed by email, and the conclusion of these email discussions are reflected in these CRs.

The current charging service specification does not accurately describe the behaviour of the SCS when a charging reservation is closed. The descriptive text in the behaviour of several methods indicates that applications may request that reservations are closed without closing the charging session. This may be misinterpreted as allowing applications to establish a further reservation on the same session. This is not the intended behaviour of the charging SCS. This ambiguity can be well seen for instance in the description of the parameter closeReservation.

The proposal is to introduce an additional state transition in the charging STD and clarify state behaviour to ensure that closure of a charging reservation results in no further charging reservation actions are supported as part of that session. If this change is not made, the consequence would be an inconsistent and ambiguous SCS definition resulting in varying implementation approaches.

This change comes from implementer's feedback, and results in interoperability problems – there is not even an exception carrying enough information, only Task_Refused. This should be mentioned in the CRs.

Agreed with these changes, updated to 394 and 395

394 and 395

Agreed.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030377	Rel 4 CR 29.198-5 Response Requested Correction	AePONA	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Updated to 396
N5-030378	Rel 4 CR 29.198-5 Response Requested Correction	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Updated to 397
N5-030396	Rel 4 CR 29.198-5 Correction of responseRequested behaviour and sendInfoRes	AePONA	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed.
N5-030397	Rel 5 CR 29.198-5 Correction of responseRequested behaviour and sendInfoRes	AePONA	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed.

These come from a contribution to Dublin (N5-021088,89,90), for which no conclusion was reached. Some email discussion took place concluding that the issue existis and a solution is needed, and now the original CRs are presented to this meeting to see what is the feeling of the group. This solution is in line with previous proposals.

The responseRequested paramater currently only has meaning for successful results and not errors in the case of the sendInfoReq method. In addition the same parameter may also be interpreted inappropriately when used with the sendInfoAndCollectReq method as the corresponding result method is the only mechanism for returning the collected information, and therefore must be generated in response to the request. The current lack of clarity in the specification may result in different functional implementations of the interface and model, from application and SCS perspective.

There appears to be an imbalance between the behaviour of sendInfoRes and sendInfoErr as described in the behaviour above. The above for sendInfoErr may be interpreted that this method is always sent from the SCS to the application in the event of unsuccessful user interaction, irrespective of the value of responseRequested in the original application invocation.

Therefore errors are handled differently from successful conditions from the applications perspective. Application programmers may therefore assume that they may be free to release resources because they have not requested a response, whereas SCS developers may assume that they must send an error.

AePONA propose that the same behaviour that relates to sendInfoRes as controlled by the responseRequested parameter should also apply to the sendInfoErr behaviour, thereby providing a balanced interface to application developers.

Thus this contribution proposes to add clarification on intended behaviour of the sendInfoErr method with respect to the responseRequested parameter, and clarify that P_UI_RESPONSE_REQUIRED does not influence sendInfoAndCollectReq behaviour. If not approved, specifications are open to differing interpretations, and interoperability problems shall occur.

In some cases the parameter names might be a bit misleading but it is not proposed to change them.

Comment: two colours for the revision marks have been used to distinguish the little that has been changed from the Dublin contribution. They should be changed for the plenary version.

Comment: proposal to explain the STDs starting from the Active state and detailing the two ways out of it.

Approved with the changes in revision marks. To be updated to 396 and 397.

396 and 397

Agreed.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030216	Clarify behaviour when deleting contracts/profiles/client apps	Gareth Carroll, Open API Solutions	Parlay 3/4	Tdoc	Agreed.

Not a 3GPP CR.

The Framework specification does not make explicit the behaviour to be expected when the Enterprise Operator deletes Service Contracts/Profiles or Client Applications.

This contribution proposes to modify the description of deleteClientApp to explicitly state that calling the method will result in the termination of an access session for that client application if there is one. It is also proposed modifying the descriptions of deleteServiceContract and deleteServiceProfile so that they state that calling the method will result in the termination of any service instances being governed by the contract/profile.

Comment: this wording may have some impact in the HA discussion – this contribution assumes a single client application. Agreed that if this is the case then a further change can be made in the future (this part is not in 3GPP is thus not under change control).

Note that this contribution is for both Parlay 3 and Parlay 4.

Approved.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030217	Clarify erroneous field in TpServiceProfileDescription	Gareth Carroll, Open API Solutions	Parlay 3/4	Tdoc	Rejected. The problem is agreed but not the solution.

Not a 3GPP CR.

There is an error in the definition of the Service Profile (TpServiceProfileDescription). This structure contains a field called ServiceTypeName. As a profile will never exist independently of a service contract then this field MUST NOT contradict the value in the corresponding field in the service contract. It is surely impossible to have a service profile (which is a restriction of a service contract) for a different service type than the corresponding service contract. The presence of this field calls for the Framework to validate or ignore it when it is passed in to createServiceProfile. A note should be added to this field to indicate that its value should be completely ignored. Ideally the field should be removed at some future point.

This contribution proposes to add a note to the ServiceTypeName field stating that its value should be ignored, and that the field will be removed at a future point (for backwards compatibility).

Comment: this needs to be described differently – we cannot remove the field because of BC, also this TpServiceProfileDescription is used in both directions across the interface, so

- the FW should set this field as the same value as the corresponding field of the service contract
- the FW should ignore the value sent by the application to ensure interoperability
- the application should be required to send the right value.

The problem is agreed but not the solution.

Rejected.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030215	Clarify situation with service contracts and profiles	Gareth Carroll, Open API Solutions	Parlay 3/4	Tdoc	Rejected.

Not a 3GPP CR.

The Framework specification contains ambiguities over whether the existence of a Service Contract alone is enough to allow an application access to that service. These ambiguities were crept in when the Service Subscription interfaces were rearranged for Parlay 3.0. The author's intention during the original reworking of the Service Subscription interfaces was that a service profile should be a restriction of the service contract, and that there should not have to be a service profile in existence in order for an application to have access to a service, as long as a suitable contract existed.

Comment: Figure 2 should be changed to reflect this clarification - currently the diagram shows that the service contract contains one or more service profiles.

Comment: is this contribution just saying that it is possible to have a single service profile that is identical to the contract? The current specification does not allow using the contract as a service profile. Need to get clarification from Gareth.

Rejected.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030219	The role of the activity timer needs to be clarified	Gareth Carroll, Open API Solutions	Parlay 3/4	Tdoc	Noted.

Not a 3GPP CR.

The role of the activity timer, when it should be started and stopped, and where it actually resides needs to be discussed. There are ambiguities over when the timer should be stopped and also over what the timer is guarding against – the contributors believe that it should be guarding against holding network resources, not just object resources, which simply creating a call object doesn't actually do.

This contribution asks the meeting to first decide whether the activity timer should only be guarding against the call object being held indefinitely or whether there should be an activity timer on the legs to guard against holding network resources indefinitely. If the latter, then we request that the meeting should then discuss whether to still have an activity timer on the call level to ensure that the call object is not held indefinitely. We could perhaps have both.

Open API Solutions would like to propose that the activity timer should be on a per leg basis. There are no API changes required for this, as the activity timer is purely a behavioural thing. All we would need to do would be to modify section 7.2 (call STD) and section 7.3 (call leg STD) to state that the activity timer should be started when the leg is interrupted and to state which methods on the call leg should stop that activity timer (we believe it should be routeReq, release, deassign and continueProcessing).

If the meeting agrees with the proposal, then Open API Solutions will produce a CR with the necessary text changes to be considered at this meeting or to go for e-mail approval.

Comment: there are already timers in the network for this, so why should it be visible at API level how the network is managing its resources? Activity timers should only consider the API view of things.

Comment: could be that there were resources allocated in the gateway, but not yet at network level. In application originated MPCC, between createCall and createCallLeg, there are no network resources associated yet.

Comment: need clarification of what is needed here and how we want to use it.

The meeting agrees that the management of network resources should not be visible at API level. The meeting agrees that the activity timer should be on a call object basis, and reset for every activity. The specifications should be clarified accordingly.

Noted.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030220	Rel 4 - Make more explicit when the call control activity timer should be stopped in UI.	Gareth Carroll, Open API Solutions	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Rejected.
N5-030221	Rel 5 - Make more explicit when the call control activity timer should be stopped in UI.	Gareth Carroll, Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Rejected.

Make more explicit when the call control activity timer should be stopped in UI. The contribution proposes to clarify which User Interaction methods will actually stop the call control activity timer and restart it once the user interaction has been completed/aborted. We believe that these methods are IpUI.sendInfoReq, IpUI.sendInfoAndCollectReq, IpUICall.recordMessageReq, IpUICall.deleteMessageReq and IpUICall.abortActionReq. The IpUI methods should only affect the activity timer if the IpUI was created for an IpMultiPartyCall or an IpCallLeg. If not approved, without some method to pause the call control activity timer, it is very possible that the activity timer may time out whilst a user interaction is taking place, which may have undesirable results (the call will be released).

Question: is this the same issue as we discussed for CC? In UI you can play announcements, and then the times should not go off.

Answer: the motivation is similar (the belief that the activity timer is related to network resources, which the meeting didn't agree with), but there is a point – precisely for not being related to network resources, this timer is more awkward to implement.

Comment: for all other methods in the CC interface we have identified their impact in the activity timer, but not the impact of any related UICall method in the CC interface.

Agreements on the reasons for change, Rene to discuss with Gareth what is the impact of the UICall methods in the CC activity timer.

Rejected.

6 Technical discussions OSA version 2 / 3GPP Rel.5

Only essential error corrections can be taken into account. Essential means that without the intended error correction the current spec cannot be implemented (SCS and/or application side).

Note that as Parlay 4.0 has been finalised, and backwards compatibility has to be guaranteed, the assumption is that for error corrections in the scope of Parlay 4 / 3GPP Rel.5 only work around and documentation of the errors is allowed.

NOTE: No Rel-5 CR agreed by CN5 will be submitted to the next CN plenary (CN#21, Sep 2003), except for the "Java realization CRs".

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030352	Corrections to CCC	Gareth Carroll, Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	1, 3 agreed, 2 not agreed. Update the maturity table (Richard)

The Conference Call Control specification specifies the TpJoinEventInfo type. This contains OriginalDestinationAddress and RedirectingAddress fields. The TpJoinEventInfo also contains a field of type TpCallAppInfoSet. TpCallAppInfoSet also contains these fields and is also used in Multi-Party Call Control. It is redundant and confusing to have these same fields in both the type and in a field it contains.

In addition the partyJoined method has some scoping symbols "::" in the parameter list.

The sequence diagram 9.1.2 also contains an error, pre-pending the word "OLD" to "createConference".

Open API Solutions believe that Conference Call Control has not been defined as a mature specification and therefore there won't be any backwards compatibility issues in removing fields from a structure. If this is incorrect then Open API Solutions can modify this contribution to place a note next to the type, specifying that the fields are redundant and should be ignored, with the corresponding fields in TpCallAppInfoSet being used instead.

Conclusion:

- The first change is a typo. Agreed.

- Second change: the issue raised is that scoping is explicit in the text (this comes from the model) and it happens in other placed. Not agreed.

- Third change: TpCallAppInfoSet does not necessarily contain the fields mentioned, whereas in TpJoinEventInfo they're required to be there – although it could be question why they need to be always there - so it is not a straightforward case of redundancy, but anyway there is a reason to delete it. The meeting agrees that the current maturity status of CCC does not raise BC issues.

Comment: we should update the maturity table (Richard to look into that).

N5-030361	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-4 Correction to TpAudioCapabiltiesType and TpVideoCapabilitiesType to include full set of 3GPP codecs	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI Secretariat	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Agreed
N5-030362	Rel-6 CR 29.198-04-4 Correction to TpAudioCapabiltiesType and TpVideoCapabilitiesType to include full set of 3GPP codecs	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI Secretariat	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed

These contributions correct a proposal presented last meetng that had an error.

TpAudioCapabilitiesType and TpVideoCapabilitiesType do not support the full set of codecs which can be used with UMTS systems. TpAudioCapabilitiesType and TpVideoCapabilitiesType contain values to identify various audio or video codecs which are meaningless, misleading, or potentially conflicting.

The contribution proposes to

- add value to TpAudioCapabilitiesType to select 3GPP AMR audio codec.
- add value to TpVideoCapabilitiesType to select MPEG-4 video codec.
- correct values of TpAudioCapabilitiesType corresponding to MPEG-1 and MPEG-2 audio codecs.
- correct value of TpVideoCapabilitiesType corresponding to MPEG-1 video codec.

If not approved, the Multi Media Call Control API will not support the use of all of the mandatory or recommended UMTS codecs.

Question: we may have implentation problems because of needed more than 16 bits.
Answer: TpInteger is 32.

Agreed.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030212	Add ability to identify when a client app/service contract/service profile is being used	Gareth Carroll, Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Rejected. Needs clarification

The Framework specification does not allow the status of a Service Contract/Profile or Client Application to be ascertained before deletion.

Question: is this proposal BC?

Comment: difficult to understand how these data type changes help without seeing the dynamics.

Question: why should the EntOp ask the gateway for this information? The status of an application could change after the EntOp asks, before the EntOp does any action that motivated the request.

Comment: there are related changes in different contributions, it would be easier to understand if the whole picture were told together.

The meeting agrees after discussion that more clarification is needed, and unfortunately a conclusion cannot be reached without the presence of the author of the contribution.

Richard to discuss with Gareth how to best have a joint discussion: next meeting, or a confcall during or before next meeting.

Rejected.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030213	Enterprise Operator should have access to Event Notification	Gareth Carroll, Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Rejected. Needs clarification

The Event Notification interfaces are not currently in the EntOp<->FW part of the specification, even though it just as desirable for an Enterprise Operator to be made aware of services becoming available/unavailable.

There are a couple of possible ways of making these interfaces available to the Enterprise Operator:

1) We can duplicate the Event Notification interfaces from the App<->FW section in the EntOp<->FW section.

2) We can recognise that the App<->FW and EntOp<->FW event notification interfaces should perhaps be commoned up (not a backwards compatible solution).

This contribution proposes changes following option 1.

Question: do we have requirements for this? That would help understand what is required from these interfaces.

Answer: no, this is the reason why this part is not in 3GPP.

Question: this doc cannot be addressed in isolation; 218, that describes the events, is also needed.

Answer: no, the point of this contribution is that the existing events are useful for the EntOp as well.

Question: why does option 2 violate BC?

Answer: we'd need to change the parameters interchanged (where it says App it should be more general).

Comment: not having requirements makes it difficult to measure this functionality against something, and to understand what is intended to achieve.

The meeting agrees that Parlay/ETSI needs to discuss what they want as a future evolution of this API. Richard to lead this discussion.

On the other hand Parlay has implicitly expressed a wish to have this functionality – since it is part of the spec – and contributions like these just make this functionality better.

Proposal: all these discussions really boil down to the question whether the EntOp must be able to interact dynamically with the FW. We need to have a discussion on what we really want these interfaces to do. This will be the discussion that Richard will propose to Gareth.

Rejected.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030218	Add events to allow an entop to identify when a client app/service contract/service profile is being used	Gareth Carroll, Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Not discussed without the author.

Not discussed – after 212 and 213, the meeting felt that it was difficult to discuss these contributions without the presence of their author and main contributor to the EntOp API.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030214	Introduce a ServiceID field to TpServiceProfileDescription	Gareth Carroll, Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Not discussed without the author.

Not discussed – after 212 and 213, the meeting felt that it was difficult to discuss these contributions without the presence of their author and main contributor to the EntOp API.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030222	Rel 5 - Unnecessary method calls needed after continueProcessing.	Gareth Carroll, Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Rejected. Needs more discussion

Unnecessary method calls needed after continueProcessing. The contribution proposes to replace the existing text with: "When entering this state the routing information is interpreted, and the authority of the calling party to establish this connection is verified. Note that no call leg connection is set up to the remote party at this point for an INTERRUPT event. In this case, the behaviour to be expected from invoking continueProcessing() depends on whether the application has changed the destination of the call (via adding another leg and routing it manually). If the application has done nothing to affect the destination, then continueProcessing will set up a terminating leg automatically based on the received information. If the application has explicitly created and routed the terminating leg (thereby informing the network of a new destination for the call), optionally

using the address information from the Address_Analysed event, then continueProcessing() will only affect the originating leg. If the call is deassigned (the application relinquishes control) in this state, the network will set-up the connection to the terminating leg automatically based on the received information."

If not approved, if the application writer misunderstands the spec, or the application logic is faulty, then it could be the case that the INTERRUPT notification comes in, the app calls continueProcessing and then everything just sits there. The caller doesn't get connected to their destination and resources are tied up as the activity timer would have been stopped when continueProcessing was called.

Comment: Disagreement with two statements.

- Applications can do deassignCall, so the call can continue in the network without having to be routed.
- If continueProcessing it's not true that all sit there

Comment: we need to clarify whether continueProcessing is needed before doing deassigned, anything else is clear.

Comment: the only way to change the destination of the call is to do create and route.

Rene to discuss with Gareth off line.

Rejected.

N5-030357	Correction to predefined attributes for Presentity Type	Teltier (Guda Venkatesh)	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Rejected. Document late. Needs further discussion. Postponed to next meeting

The current specification has an ambiguous and multiple definitions for presence attributes for a pre-defined type called Presentity. Section 11.10 is incompatible and redundant with the definition of "Presentity" type in 11.4.1. The IDL for PAM has resolved this partially (perhaps accidentally) by defining TpPresenceData as a fixed structure containing the items described in Section 11.10 as fields in a structure (and ignoring the actual definition of TpPresenceData as an attribute list). However, the current interpretation of the IDL makes the presence record non-extensible which is not desirable at all requiring change requests every time a new attribute is to be added to the presence record or a new type of presence record is created for applications other than those envisioned in the current use cases of 3GPP Presence Service Requirements. This proposal is a fix to this inconsistent definition that maintains the strict typing that can be checked at compile time for known presence attributes while allowing for extensibility.

The proposal consists of several changes to the PAM data definitions. It is summarized as follows:

1. Define a TpPAMPresentityPresenceTuple containing the presence tuple structure consistent with 3GPP TS 22.141 and the Presence model in IETF RFC 2778. This is almost the same as the currently defined TpPAMPresenceData in the IDL (not in the specification) using the definitions in the current section 11.10.
2. Define TpPAMPresenceData as a generic list of attributes as currently defined in the specification in section 11.3.3 with a slight modification to make it consistent with TpPAMPresentityPresenceTuple.
3. Define a TpPAMPresenceProfile as a tagged union of TpPAMPresentityPresenceTuple and TpPAMPresenceData.
4. Change TpPAMAvailabilityProfile to use TpPAMPresenceProfile rather than the previous TpPAMPresenceData.

Comment: this CR addresses two problems:

- the one identified by Telcordia (see Tdoc 338)
- it tries to merge two data types (those in 11.4 and 11.10)

that are solved with a single solution. Not convinced this is the best possible solution, there is some additional complexity because there are really two types of data (a generic profile and an extensible profile).

Answer: in 3GPP there is a type of presence record, but we need to accommodate some data coming from IM. Only addressing that would not be extendable in the future.

Comment: proposed to have a single data type.

Response: not all identities are presentities, but for the ones that are it should be possible to obtain all presence information from it.

Comment: no time to get company feedback because the contribution was available only today.

For next meeting.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030379	Rel 5 CR 29.198-2 Java Realisation Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update to 412, 413
N5-030380	Rel 5 CR 29.198-3 Java Realisation Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update to 414
N5-030381	Rel 5 CR 29.198-4-1 Java Realisation Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update to 415
N5-030382	Rel 5 CR 29.198-4-2 Java Realisation Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update to 416
N5-030383	Rel 5 CR 29.198-4-3 Java Realisation Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update to 417
N5-030384	Rel 5 CR 29.198-4-4 Java Realisation Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update to 418
N5-030385	Rel 5 CR 29.198-4-5 Java Realisation Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update to 419

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030412	Rel-5 CR 29.198-01 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 379. Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030413	Rel-5 CR 29.198-02 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 379. Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030414	Rel-5 CR 29.198-03 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 380. Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030415	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-1 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 381. Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030416	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-2 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 382. Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030417	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-3 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 383. Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030418	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-4 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 384. Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030420	Rel-5 CR 29.198-05 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030421	Rel-5 CR 29.198-06 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030422	Rel-5 CR 29.198-07 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030423	Rel-5 CR 29.198-08 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030426	Rel-5 CR 29.198-11 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030427	Rel-5 CR 29.198-12 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030428	Rel-5 CR 29.198-13 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030429	Rel-5 CR 29.198-14 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.

NOTE: Only the "Java realization CRs" agreed by CN5 will be submitted to the next CN plenary (CN#21, Sep 2003). N5-030412/418 & N5-030420/429 (17 CRs)

N5-030379 contains a word document which is the CR, plus a zip with the code, plus the J2SE, included in this first contribution since it cannot be split for each part.

The CR is based on the one that was accepted in San Diego. The text for annex C is identical to the one approved for inclusion in Part 1.

The code has been provided by AePONA, compiled and tested by them; the tools used are provided to ETSI as was done in the case of WSDL, so the Java realization can be managed in the same way as the rest (using the sausage machine), instead of hand-maintained via company contributions.

The text can be updated when/if the J2EE realization is available; it will then be provided as a separate archive so developers can chose and use each of them.

Comment: if the J2EE is provided later, then it's going to be difficult to have it approved for Rel5, since it is frozen and we just got a special extension for this because it is functionality that we lost from Rel5. It is not desirable to include this text without having the files. IBM intended to provide the J2EE archive, so the question is whether this can be ready for next plenary. The Part 1 CRs approved includes rules for J2EE too, but these could be changed for next plenary.

Q: why can't we create Java docs per API?

A: the links cannot be read otherwise. Agreed that there is value in supplying a Java doc. The Part 1 annex will be changed to refer to it.

Comment: all Java documents have JAIN as title.

Comment: references to AePONA's authorship in the Java code should be deleted (taken out from the generation tool). In the WSDL there is just the filename and the date. Ultan will send an email to Eamonn with details on this.

Conclusion: find out before the end of the meeting if IBM will have the J2EE ready for next plenary. If yes, a paragraph will be added for each of the annexes in AePONA's CRs. If not, a CR will be written to remove the rules for J2EE in part 1, and

J2EE will not be part of Rel5. If no answer if received from IBM before the end of the meeting then a "no" will be assumed, and J2EE will be considered only for Rel6. Depending on the response from IBM, Eamonn will prepare CR accordingly for email approval, so company Java experts can give feedback.

All this applies also to 380, 381, 382, 383, 384. A new CR is needed for each part, plus one more for Part 1. Parts not in the 3GPP specs don't need CRs just Tdocs. Updates will be 412-429, for email approval.

Note that the CN#20 plenary, having made an exception to the frozen status of Rel5, asked CN5 to have this ready ASAP. Therefore, **even though according to our pattern we're not presenting any CRs to the next plenary, we will present these, only**.

7 Framework session

7.1 High Availability (HA)

Discussions based on AePONA's San Diego contributions and email discussion since.

N5-030354	Application HA using Callbacks	AePONA	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4, OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Noted.

Document N5-030192 was submitted to CN5#23 in San Diego. A lack of meeting time and the projected length of meeting time required to discuss this item resulted in the document not being presented or discussed in San Diego. The unaltered contribution is therefore re-submitted to the CN5#24 meeting in San Francisco and is included in the N5-030354 Zip file.

Highly Available application implementations may be supported via API callback mechanisms. Currently this is restricted to the Application – SCS interface. As a result Application – FW functionality cannot be supported in a highly available fashion with the existing APIs. This document outlines a proposed solution to this issue. Every effort has been made to ensure a backward compatible solution and to minimise resulting change to the API. In addition to the solution, the document identifies the specifications that would require change in order to implement the solution.

This document seeks to present some of the known or currently understood issues that AePONA believes requires some form of discussion and decision. Where possible similar or interrelated issues are presented together and a proposal to reach satisfactory resolution is made.

Requirement for API based HA

Additional application callbacks are supported within the SCSs, whereby an application may use setCallBack and notification provisioning mechanisms (e.g. enableCallNotification) supported within the API to create a secondary callback to an identical application instance or image that may be used in the event of application failover. However no such mechanism for informing the framework of the additional application instance or image is available. This limitation results in a dependency on a purely middleware based approach to ensure highly available applications, and consequently a significant risk of interoperability problems as a consequence of differing middleware behaviour and functionality. Note that although the primary motivation for this proposal is to ensure application high availability, any solution may be equally applicable to ensure support for additional application instances with a view to supporting load sharing between gateway and applications. If there is a decision that all High Availability and Redundancy issues are best addressed through middleware and vendor implementation then this should be clearly indicated in the specification set, and possibly the API based HA features removed in order to prevent confusion.

A purely middleware based solution to Application High Availability can result in a single point of failure between the Gateway OSA Parlay SCSs and Framework, and the Application Domain.

Solution for API based HA

In order to rectify the limitations of the API based HA solution it is necessary that the framework must also be made aware of the existence of a secondary application image or instance. The use of a 'setCallBack' style solution as used within the SCSs was considered inappropriate as it could result in many changes to Framework Interface classes. In addition, such a mechanism would also presume that application instances would share Framework object references in order to establish callback references. This is considered a potentially serious security loophole. . In addition, the Framework obtainInterface(WithCallBack) paradigm already exists to provide applications and framework a mechanism to establish interface and callback references.

The solution proposed here assumes that existing Application and Framework message sequences are re-used between primary and secondary application instance, with the addition of sufficient identification so that the Framework can reconcile between

primary and secondary and allow application recovery. This approach ensures that the Trust and Security mechanisms resident within the framework are rigorously applied to both primary and secondary application instances. A single application is provided that requires a unique application ID with respect to the Parlay Gateway/Framework. To ensure HA operation the application consists of a number of identical instances (A & A') to provide a primary/secondary solution. Each application instance behaves in an identical fashion both on initialisation and recovery.

The contribution details the changes in the specifications resulting from this discussion.

Discussion

This contribution was discussed in support of the contribution below (363). The traditional approach to resolving CORBA server resilience and high availability is to employ clustering style solutions. Whilst this approach succeeds in non-Application server deployments where persistent IORs and a common or shared IP address within a cluster may be configured, Application Server Platforms typically employ a different clustering design that requires dual IP addresses.

It is primarily for this reason that AePONA believes that an API based HA solution is necessary.

Telcordia were not convinced that this is true and a reason for using HA in the API.

N5-030363	Application HA Discussion (email thread)	AePONA	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4, OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Noted.

AePONA and IBM submitted several contributions to CN5#23 in San Diego that identified problems in supporting application high availability with the current APIs. At the San Diego meeting, a discussion on this topic took place, including the drafting of requirements or principles that should be considered in satisfactorily resolving this issue. No decisions were agreed during San Diego, and the meeting recommended that further email discussion should take place and that the topic would be further discussed during the San Francisco meeting.

This document outlines the email discussion that took place, post San Diego, via the email exploder. The full email text is repeated below, as it provides an accurate reflection of the current thinking, and also lists the requirements or principles that were drafted during the San Diego meeting. No decisions have been reached as a result of the email discussion.

This information is presented as input to the San Francisco meeting in order to recap on the discussions thus far.

Considering point 1 of the E-mail discussion

Lucent believe that implementation should be able to solve this, as any other solution at this point would require behavioural changes to the API.

AePONA feel that we should find an open API solution to this, if not then we should remove any existing reference to this from the API.

Ericsson believes they would have problem solving this at the lower layers. If one has implementation specific solutions then interoperability would then be an issue. To this end the API should be as interoperable as possible. Application failover and recovery was not demonstrated at the Interoperability event in ETSI, as individuals were solving this problem in many different ways, which goes to highlight the problem of solving this in the API. However Lucent feel that there are shortcomings in the proposed solution. Anders feels that maybe some supporting text should be added to the API if needed

Ultan felt that the issue here is to find a harmonised way of solving this, as interoperability should be maintained, this could be done within the API or via a White paper. To recap AePONA feel that if we don't get a suitable solution to this then we will get vendor specific solutions driving the uptake of the API.

Anders proposed three alternatives:

- One to continue with what AePONA suggest and bring this into the API with suitable text
- Or a white paper that describes how this should be done. AePONA feel that this and the sub bullet blow would still mean vendor specific solutions
    - Or change descriptions in the doc to explain things such as the call back problem
- Or leave it as it is today an have no interoperability.

Chelo feels that it may be possible to have a solution that effects existing and past version of the release, and another for future solutions. However as explained by Lucent this would mean maintaining two different versions of the FW (remember the authentication methods).

Ericsson feels that any solution should not change the behaviour and should be backward compatible.

The issue of solving high availability outside of the API can be solved, but not an interoperable solution. Lucent feel that this is the point as telecom vendors compete in this area specifically. Marconi feel that the solution from AePONA is to detailed and would remove this vendor competition, which should remain.

Regarding points 2 and 3 of the e-mail discussion; which are to make a list of problems that should be addressed and determine if any tactical solutions can be integrated into Re5 and which strategic solutions should be made to Rel 6.

AePONA is not against tactical solutions as long as they are not deprecated when strategic solutions are put into place. Chelo reminds that long before Rel 5 was frozen requirements were frozen. AePONA feels that this could be open to interpretation. And they were not aware that Rel5 was to be frozen when the contributions were brought into San Diego. So lets see the solution and then decide.

Here we looked at the topics that need to be considered to find a suitable solution that were documented in San Diego.

Red Italic text below shows some of the discussion points

1) The high availability solution must provide stable and continuous operation across fail over and recovery

2) Determine the levels of functionality and if the solution is restricted by the binary compatibility requirement and the phases of implementation

3) Need to determine the mode of operation (failover vs. load sharing) *Ericsson: If we prioritise failover then we may preclude load balancing!*

4) Redundancy of Parlay managers and callbacks (and possibly other objects that are long-lived objects) is necessary for continuous support. *Redundancy meaning – mechanism to support continuous operation of the service in the event of failure (an* alternative path of this is failure) -→ unusual way of operator re-established in the event of failure.

5) How many levels of redundancy should be supported (primary/secondary only, or n-ary backups), or in other words how many concurrent failures can be tolerated.

6) How will redundant call-backs be specified (implicitly which is compatible with concurrent semantics and interfaces, or explicitly which should some extra parameters on certain methods)

7) Bi-directional recovery model should be supported, meaning that not only the client application can have backups, but also the Gateway service managers and frameworks can have backups.

8) How is recovery enabled? (1 What is the time/opportunity allowance mechanisms for either system to recover, without the system terminating; 2) Does the Framework need to have knowledge of all service managers and SCSs; (3 Does the Framework need to be notified when the client app or SCS is in a recovery state; (4 At what point does security need to be enforced. *This is an important point here that any solution has to take into account Security, otherwise it will not be acceptable.*

9) Also as part of this work we should determine if it is desirable to split IpService into IpServicemanager and IpServiceSession, and leave IpService as an empty interface and make sure that all other objects properly inherit, so that setCallBack() and setCallBackWithSessionID() are not mutually exclusive in the same interface. *If we split up IpService etc, then we will loose binary backward compatibility, meaning that different release will not inter-work.*

Anders wants to know if the solution will be applicable to all releases of the API. It was reiterated that we need to firstly decide what the solution is and then see if it is applicable to all releases of the API.

A requirements statement needs to be drafted which states the least we want to solve for High availability. The requirements need to state which releases it addresses. This may mean requirements into SA1 or just for our JWG Requirements doc. For the moment we think that the requirements should just be internal.

After the San Diego meeting Scott drafted these requirements, which are two e-mail threads, the second thread appears first:

******************Scott's Requirements text starts here*****************

Scott's Second proposal

If a more conservative approach is desired.

The Parlay/OSA API consists of bi-directional interfaces. These interfaces consist of interfaces that act as either long-lived manager interfaces or transient session interfaces. The manager interfaces should provide high availability features to ensure the continuous operation of the system. Manager interfaces will be specifically identified.

Remote objects of interfaces that act as managers and their callbacks will provide the following features:

1) Capable of being redundantly implemented.

2) Capable of passing multiple object references to the client of the

redundant object, such that the ordering implicit for compatibility with

the current approach.

3) Capable of setting and resetting the client references multiple times,

thereby providing recoverability.

4) Binary compatibility will previous versions will not sacrificed, and the

changes to the API should be minimal and backward compatible.

6) Capable of supporting a single backup for redundant objects.

7) When a recoverable failure occurs, the framework or client of the framework will notify the other that it is in a recovery state, and when the recovery is completed. And, the system will not be automatically

terminated while in a recovery state.

The high availability features will be implemented in a manner that is independent of a specific transport or technology, such as fault tolerant CORBA, Web Services, or features of a particular ORB.

API Interoperability is the primary goal, and to provide interoperable high availability of the complete system, the semantics of the API should be well defined, and basic high availability should be specified within the API.

Scott's First proposal

Here is a proposed requirements statement for discussion on the High Availability support in the Parlay / OSA API.

The Parlay/OSA API consists of bi-directional interfaces. These interfaces consist of interfaces that act as either long-lived (manager) interfaces or transient session interfaces. The session related interfaces are not required to provide high availability features

The manager interfaces should provide high availability features to ensure the continuous operation of the system. Manager interfaces will be specifically identified. Remote objects of interfaces that act as managers and their callbacks will provide the following features:

1) Capable of being redundantly implemented. Application Framework and Service capability object will have the capability of being redundant.

2) Capable of passing multiple object references to the client of the redundant object, such that the ordering of the redundant callbacks are explicit.

3) Capable of setting and resetting the client references multiple times, thereby providing recoverability.

4) Binary compatibility with previous versions will be sacrificed to achieve a reliable system, and the changes required by applications should be minimal.

5) The operational mode of failover vs. load sharing of redundant objects should be configurable.

6) Capable of supporting any number of redundant objects.

7) When a recoverable failure occurs, the framework or client of the framework will notify the other that it is in a recovery state, and when the recovery is completed. And, the system will not be automatically terminated while in a recovery state.

The high availability features will be implemented in a manner that is independent of a specific transport or technology, such as fault tolerant CORBA, Web Services, or features of a particular ORB.

********** **This is the end of Scott's text**********

The text was discussed within the meeting with the following final text being proposed:

The Parlay/OSA API consists of bi-directional interfaces. These interfaces consist of interfaces that act as either long-lived (manager) interfaces or transient (session) interfaces.
Requirements for high availability are applicable to the long-lived (manager) interfaces to ensure the continuous operation of the system. They do not apply to the session related interfaces. Long-lived (Manager) interfaces will be specifically identified.
The following are the requirements for the high availability solution:
1) Application, Framework and Service Capability objects will be capable of being implemented redundantly.
2) Solution is capable of supporting any number of redundant objects.
3) Actions used to create redundant objects should be repeatable and undoable so that redundant objects may be managed or taken out of service, thereby providing a dynamically scalable solution.
4) The solution will not prevent using redundant objects for load sharing.
5) The solution will ensure that information is retained long enough to permit recovery (objects are not immediately terminated in the case of recoverable failure).

Lucent requested to know what we want to do with this as a committee. The requirements seem to be very detailed. The chairman stated that this was a necessary exercise to find out what exactly the solution will be based upon (that is if there is an acceptable solution.)

Ericsson feels that providing a HA solutions without considering the API will be impossible to do.

There was a feeling that if we ensure complete interoperability and HA then there is no differentiation between vendor products. This was refuted, as interoperability would not mean that all products had the same functionality or reliability etc., so there would be differentiation here, giving the customer choice.

From an operator point of view BT supported the need for Interoperability and HA and therefore were in support of these requirements and the proposed task in hand.

Ultan felt that if there was an acceptable Off API solution documented then this could be discussed. He also felt that whilst there maybe differentiation in vendor products, the API should not be the weak link.

What about GSM, this was very successful in interoperability. It was pointed out that GSM protocols are SS#7 based which consists of seven different layers which have High availability.

Within CORBA there are some standards that support HA. However not all ORB implementations of CORBA are interoperable. It maybe that some of these solutions may be able to be provided by having High availability ORBs and therefore not having to make the solution in the API.

Proposal: For Release 5 all we can do is guidelines, so lets do them now. These guidelines would then show if we need something else for Release 6.0. AePONA said that a satisfactory solution of Release 5 maybe a set of guidelines, but it does not remove the need for HA and Interoperability for this and further releases.

So we need more justification for this requirement in this API. Therefore the Requirements need to be put through SA1.

Eammon summarized that it would be difficult to put a full and complete solution into Rel5 as not all agree to the solution or to the requirement. It was agreed that we will not propose a CR to Rel 5.

So for Rel 5 the only other option is some guidelines to show the problem statement and how it should be handled. This could be achieved by an Annex to Release 5, which would be a Cat F change. This would have to be a normative annex. If we put it in as an informative annex would be thrown out by the CN plenary.

A Parlay white paper could be provided, this would at least provide some text, and may be the least favourable solution.

Favourable Solution

In Part 1 of the API, there are three Annexes that give detailed explanations of the different implementations, it may be possible to add some text in here explaining this. This could be a solution for a Release 5 change and would be the most favourable approach.

If we have a solution that is specific to CORBA (e.g. addressing the issues about ORBS above) then this should only go in the CORBA section. What we need is a generic text for the whole set of annexes.

The next step is therefore to write this text, which would be the subject of further contributions. Ericsson and AePONA will consider a joint contribution for this, which will be discussed via e-mail. We also need to be reminded that requirements for Rel 6.0 will be frozen in September, so any detailed API solution, needs a new requirement before then.

We may have an ad-hoc meeting in September to discuss this in detail. This would then provide a final solution for the October meeting.

7.2 Integrity Management

N5-030364	Service Integrity Management	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030364r1	Service Integrity Management - Use cases requiring support of Integrity Management at a service level in addition to current service instance level	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Noted.

The reason for the revision is some comments from Gareth that have been taken into account.

Document N5-030187 was submitted to CN5#23 in San Diego to introduce corrections to the Framework Integrity Management functionality. Part of this contribution suggested introducing support for integrity management at a service level in addition to the currently supported service instance level. As a result of the discussion in that meeting (see report, N5-030107), AePONA wish to put forward some use cases in support of introducing service level integrity management within the Framework. If the meeting agrees that the use cases confirm the need for this functionality, AePONA shall prepare necessary CRs to support this behaviour. As this is considered new Framework functionality above and beyond that originally envisaged for the framework, AePONA propose that this functionality would be introduced in OSA Rel 2/ 3GPP Rel 5/ Parlay 4.

Proposed use case #1: separation of service supplier and service capability, to support a logical and possibly physical separation between the entity responsible for provisioning SCSs within the network and the SCSs themselves, so all SCS implementations do not need to replicate the service supplier implementation. In supporting the separation, it is possible and desirable to support Framework Access Session between the framework and serviceInstanceLifecycleManager.

Proposed use case #2: introduce support for a Framework management client solution. The management client would have the ability to carry out Framework based Integrity Management without physically using the service capability and establishing a service instance. If support for Integrity Management is only provided at the service instance level, then all clients must establish a service instance and use the network resource. The Framework management client cannot be supported using service instance integrity management as the client makes no use of the network resources.

Proposed use case #3: support the ability for application clients to query service level integrity and thereafter apply some selection criteria when choosing a service within the selected SCS domain. For example where multiple same/similar SCS are registered with the Framework, the application may include logic to query load or fault reports related to the SCS for which they have a valid subscription, before signing a service level agreement to use a given SCS.

In supporting service level integrity management, AePONA is not proposing to replace existing functionality, but rather extend the scope and flexibility of the framework management capabilities. Supporting both service and service instance level integrity management shall require a defined mechanism to indicate whether a client is interested in service or service instance integrity management. If

Comment: the contribution says the changes are proposed for Rel5.

A: this is because this discussion has been on the table since before Rel5 was frozen. The intention is now to have these additions for Rel6.

Q: in use case #1, the service supplier can already register multiple services to the FW.

A: yes, all this is not meant to be mandated, but the API should be flexible to allow a choice – access sessions with a service supplier and a service, and at a service instance when the application decides to use this service.

Q: so is it adding interfaces to the service instance lifecycle manager for integrity management or is it more that that? Why is it required to have an access session between the framework and serviceInstanceLifecycleManager?

A: a single service supplier cannot register multiple SCSs; the FW should be able to recognize and manage each of them from the point of view of integrity management. For integrity management to be supported an access session is necessary – not because of authentication etc but in order to obtain references.

Q: the use cases seem interesting but only when seeing the detailed technical changes it can be judged whether to have them or not.

A: seeing all use cases collectively it is sufficient to see the need for this independently on the technical merit.

Q: can an estimation be given on what kind of changes they would be?

A: see 187 from San Diego, or 188 for the Access CR.

Q: in 188 it seems to be that the new access session step is mandatory.

A: it is not intended like this, it means that if this functionality is to be supported then this step is necessary. This text would be changed in the new Rel6 CR if this proposal is accepted.

Q: how does this affect the compliance?

A: we can have conditional requirements like we already have for Charging.

Q: still not clear why the need for an access session.

A: this is the way Integrity Management works currently in the FW.

Q: when an application selects a service and signs a SLA, the whole model is meant for a long period of time; it seems strange that an application would select a service and sign an SLA based on information like load which changes very dynamically.

A: we're talking about integrity management in an API, not about load management related to network resources. Also this is necessary for supporting HA, although it was decided to separate the two issues in different contributions.

Q: is selection criteria intended for during service discovery or SLA?

A: discovery.

Q: so still see no need to select a service based on the dynamic behaviour of the moment.

A: assuming identical multiple services of the same type deployed in the network, based on the performance and operation of the lifecycle manager that creates the instances of the managers of the services, this gives usual behaviour and use information between applications and resources. Not only load but also fault – fault reports from the service lifecycle manager can tell the application whether it is in a condition to be used.

Q: does it mean registration should also be extended? How often would this be refreshed?

A: changes to the discovery sequence are optional, not mandated in this proposal. This information can be obtained by the FW via integrity management, no need to use registration for it.

Q: adding more dynamic information to this interface would be beyond its purpose, which is providing the application with the necessary information to make a choice. Providing static information is already supported.

A: we shouldn't assume the use case is tied to a single certain implementation. Flexibility is desirable.

Conclusion: no agreement on this use case.

Three out of four use cases have support from the meeting. They are all related to the same changes – the one in 188, plus identification – which are not intended to be mandated but allowed. Agreed that the use cases have generated enough interest in the meeting to understand the motivation, and AePONA is welcome to provide the corresponding contributions to Rel6.

8 Parlay X session

Discussions on templates to publish Parlay X specifications as ETSI and 3GPP specifications. Also other Parlay X related contributions.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030334	Decide whether Acct Mgr changes should address Rel-5	IBM (Scott Broussard)	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Noted. Changes are necessary to Account management to support Parlay X, which is Rel-6, however it is intended to be supportable on Rel-5, which would also require these changes

Noted.

N5-030335	Rel-5 CR29.198-11 Update Acct Management to enable Parlay X	IBM (Scott Broussard)	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Rejected.
N5-030336	Rel-6 CR29-198-11 Update Acct Mgmt to enable Parlay X	IBM (Scott Broussard)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed.

335

Account Management updates required to support Parlay X. Presented to San Diego (185, updated to 232) but held until Parlay X became a part of the 3GPP spec, so they're re-submitted without changes.

This is a Rel5 CR, because the intention of Parlay X is to be supported by Rel5 of the base APIs as well.

Comment: since we target Rel6 for PX, the "consequences if not approved" are not accurate, since Parlay X can really be implemented using OSA interfaces (Rel6 OSA interfaces).

Comment: CatB is an additional feature, and now only CatF CRs are allowed. It is very clear that this is new functionality.

Comment: Parlay made it very clear that Parlay X was not constrained by the base Parlay APIs.

Comment: why wanting PX to be usable with OSA Rel5? It can be implemented by individual companies.

Rejected.

336

Same change as 335 but for Rel6.

Agreed.

N5-030369	Parlay X formatted as ETSI Specification	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI Secretariat		TS	Noted

This contribution is the Parlay X specification reformatted to turn it into an ETSI specification. It is based on N5-030205 as submitted to the May JWG meeting.

In ETSI, today it is known as DES/SPAN-120102, in that this is the ETSI TC SPAN work item number. This number will change, as within ETSI SPAN is soon to be closed, and its work items are being moved to a newly created TB. This has no incidence on our work, other than our ETSI work item numbers will contain the name of the new ETSI Technical Body (and also a reference to OSA project).

When finally approved, the specification will be published as a stand-alone specification, not part of the ES 201 915 or 202 915 series.

Consideration should be given to whether we will need to develop this specification in concurrent phases or releases, as is currently done with the base OSA/Parlay APIs. This would impact the way the document is structured.

What has been changed from N5-030205 (Parlay-published Parlay X):

- Full ETSI style sheet, layout and fonts have been applied.
- Title changed to: Open Service Access (OSA); Web Services API for OSA; (Parlay X). This is just a proposed name, suggestions are welcome.

- Parlay copyright included on front page as in all Parlay specs, so main Parlay X copyright box dropped (assumed to be covered by ETSI-Parlay agreement).
- Scope clause built out of original clauses 1.1 and 1.2. Comments on this are welcome.
- Clauses renumbered according to ETSI rules (1st 3 clause numbers are reserved, real technical content starts in clause 4)
- Former clause 1.5 (Parlay X Web Services) becomes new top level clause 4
- Former clause 1.7, new clause 4.4, modified to reflect new structure.
- All references to other clauses corrected to reflect the new clause numbering.
- All 'Record of Changes' clauses deleted (in 3GPP use CR mechanism, in ETSI we could use same mechanism as for other APIs – tables at the back of the document).
- All instances of 'Behavior' changed to 'Behaviour'. In general, British spelling should be used in ETSI specifications (see http://portal.etsi.org/edithelp/pdf/use_of_english.pdf).
- Clauses entitled 'Web Service Syntax – WSDL' have the following text added to them: 'The W3C WSDL representation of this API is contained in a set of files which accompany the present document. ' (as in our annexes). These files, not being in an annex, are in the normative part of the specification. The meeting agrees this is what we want.

  Comment: the RFC_encoded is included temporarily, until current tools support an alternative. This should be kept in mind by Parlay X, and we'll make the change accordingly.
- Old clause 7, new clause 10, contains PayCircle copyright statement in the absence of any specific copyright agreement or license from PayCircle. This statement grants reproduction rights and forbids any changes to this part of this clause, therefore it cannot remain as it currently is in an ETSI published specification. In the absence of any agreement with PayCircle, this clause 10 should be deleted (reference could be made to the Parlay published spec.)

  This statement cannot and will not stay in an ETSI spec because:

  - it gives permission to copy and reproduce it, which is not allowed by ETSI
  - forbids changes in this part of the spec without Parlay and PayCircle's permission.

  So unless this changes the Payment API cannot be published in ETSI or in 3GPP. Ultan is discussing ETSI's position and will contact Paul Ritchie with a request for this.
- Annex A deleted (list of method names) because in the table of contents the list of clause names gives the same information. Agreed that this is enough.
- No attempt has been made to introduce references to OSA or OSA/Parlay instead of simply Parlay. This will probably have to be done at least for the 3GPP format specification – the name Parlay has been removed for our 3GPP specs. For Parlay X there will be two standalone specs (3GPP and ETSI), no UML model like the base APIs, no common maintenance, so it is possible to have Parlay for the ETSI spec and OSA in the 3GPP spec. Nevertheless it is preferable that the changes in both are the same, and introduced by the same people.

Q: why is this not model driven?

A: that question has not been answered in the Parlay X WG. Which tools to use, and how to do the mapping from UML to WSDL in line with WS-I, were discussed but not agreed. Now could be a better moment to raise the question again, a satisfactory tool may be found; hopefully in the future there could be a model.

Q: what was the real reason for not having "Parlay" in the specs? Was it the difference in membership of 3GPP and Parlay?

A: not clear. But Parlay X has a name on its own.

Conclusion: Chelo to request guidance from the CN plenary.

NOTE: Ask the CN plenary about the name Parlay X:

> Our APIs are called Parlay by the Parlay Group, and OSA by the standard bodies (3GPP and ETSI). The name Parlay does not (usually) appear in the standard. But for Parlay X, it seems to us that "Parlay X Web Services" is already a recognized brand name, and we'd like to keep it like this. We could explain to the CN plenary why we believe the "OSA API Web Services" should be called "Parlay X Web Services" so will have no problem when submitting to CN for Information/Approval.

Q: Web Service interfaces instead of API, since there are some concerns about the term “API”.

A: agreed.

Q: in San Diego we discussed the relationship between Parlay X and the JWG for evolving the specs. Has this been solved?

A: The Parlay BoD in San Diego had similar concerns:
"The outcome was that Parlay X 1 stays in the JWG and is maintained using the 3GPP CR process. If Parlay or PayCircle want changes, they come to the JWG. Then Parlay or PayCircle may develop new functionality for the 2.0, and they will bring it to the JWG when it’s done. Any Parlay company can participate in the Parlay X process; companies in the JWG that are Parlay companies can as well."

Comment: concern that there may be non-Parlay companies that contribute to this process; for them there is no feedback to the Parlay+PayCircle group, which was our main concern in San Diego and is still unsolved. Concern expressed that alignment problems we had in the past and have since been avoided due to our process may arise again, since the process has been broken.

Noted.

N5-030370	Parlay X formatted as a 3GPP Specification	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI Secretariat		TS	Noted

This contribution is the Parlay X specification reformatted to turn it into a 3GPP specification. It is based on N5-030205 as submitted to the May JWG meeting.

When finally approved, the specification will be published as a stand-alone specification, not part of the TS 29.198 series.

What has been changed from N5-030205 (Parlay-published Parlay X)/

- Full 3GPP style sheet, layout and fonts have been applied.
- Title changed to: 3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Core Network; Open Service Access (OSA); Web Services API for OSA.

  Same as for the ETSI spec: “API” to be changed to “interface”.
- Parlay copyright statement included in Foreword, as required by this statement, which grants reproduction rights and forbids changes to the spec. With this in place, it is unlikely that 3GPP CN Plenary will accept this specification, so Parlay need to release the copyright if they want Parlay X to become a 3GPP specification.

  Also no Parlay copyright in the front page, according to the 3GPP rules (contributions are always company contributions from member companies, no copyrights). Noted that we never had this problem before because it was an old Parlay version when it wasn’t yet a corporation. Paul Ritchie has been informed that if this specification is to become part of 3GPP the Parlay copyright will not be there.

  A request will be sent from Ultan and forwarded by Chelo to the Parlay Board about the problems explained above with the Parlay copyright statement.
- Scope clause built out of original clauses 1.1 and 1.2.
- Clauses renumbered according to 3GPP rules (1st 3 clause numbers are reserved)
- Former clause 1.5 (Parlay X Web Services) becomes new top level clause 4
- Former clause 1.7, new clause 4.4, modified to reflect new structure.
- All references to other clauses corrected to reflect the new clause numbering.

- All 'Record of Changes' clauses deleted (in 3GPP use CR mechanism, in ETSI we could use same mechanism as for other APIs).
- All instances of 'Behavior' changed to 'Behaviour'. In general, British spelling should be used in ETSI specifications (see http://portal.etsi.org/edithelp/pdf/use_of_english.pdf).
- Clauses entitled 'Web Service Syntax – WSDL' have the following text added to them: 'The W3C WSDL representation of this API is contained in a set of files which accompany the present document.'
- Old clause 7, new clause 10, contains PayCircle copyright statement in the absence of any specific copyright agreement or license from PayCircle. This statement grants reproduction rights and forbids any changes to this part of this clause, therefore it cannot remain as it currently is in a 3GPP specification. In the absence of any agreement with PayCircle, this clause 10 should be deleted (reference could be made to the Parlay published spec.)
- Annex A deleted (list of method names)
- No attempt has been made to introduce references to OSA or OSA/Parlay instead of simply Parlay. This will probably have to be done at least for the 3GPP format specification.

As said for the ETSI spec, guidance from the CN plenary will be requested (i.e. JWG/CN5 believe the "OSA API Web Services" should be called "Parlay X Web Services"). Noted that we also have a WSDL realization of the base APIs, and it could be confused with Parlay X.

Noted.

9 Messaging session

This session will kick-off the activities for future messaging specifications: the future of GMS, discussion of a proposal for a new SCF.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030332	Rel-5 ES202195-09 Correct GMS Messaging Problems	IBM (Scott Broussard)	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030333	Rel-6 ES202195-09 Correct GMS Messaging Problems	IBM (Scott Broussard)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030387	Summary of the San Diego discussion on Messaging	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted
N5-030388	Response to N5-030340 Proposal to introduce a Messaging SCF in 3GPP Rel-6 - New Draft TS 29.198-15 V0.0.1	MCC	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted

In San Diego there were three different contributions relating to Messaging. As IBM did not wish to re-design the GMS service, they would address the problems without renaming existing messages, this maintains binary compatibility. So this Tdoc distils the problems from the last meeting. Erwin stated that Tdoc 387 is also related to this contribution and proceeded to give an presentation of this.

As regards 332

Q. Will we be able to send messages in a mailbox?

A. Yes this does cover the desired functionality. At present SMS does not support mailbox functionality.

Eamon highlighted the fact that at present the Generic Messaging SCS is really only a Mailbox management SCS and it is not appropriate to try and upgrade this to Multimedia messaging capabilities. This is therefore a good reason to provide a new SCS. Incomit believe that this is not the case and that the Generic Messaging SCS is powerful and only needs some modification and that it would be good to upgrade the UI SCS to include multimedia UI capabilities.

General discussion on Messaging

Lucent agree that functional changes need to be made, but not the process of doing this, mainly that we end up with redundancy within the two SCFs. Incomit also share this view. It is suggested that a stepwise process takes place i.e. some changes in Rel4, more changes in Rel5 etc. It was pointed out that this would be horrendous as far as BC is concerned. Therefore the provision of a new SCF would remove the BC problems. A problem that may happen here is that in the future the Generic Messaging SCF would be deprecated. Which to some is also horrendous.

At present it is difficult to provide attachments within messages.

Ericsson believed that there was an agreement in San Diego to create a new SCS for Multi-media messaging.

Ultan explained some of the problems he knew about, e.g. there is no 'send' method; an assumption is made that placing a message in the Outbox assumes that the message is sent. So there are a large number of problems with the existing SCS. According to the maturity table the Messaging SCS is stated as mature and therefore any changes would mean BC problems (even though in some peoples view, it is an SCS that has not received much development).

A proposal from Incomit was to discuss Scott's proposals for Release 5. For Release 6 we could do even more changes such as a new SCS. As far as Release 4, maybe no changes as implementations are already out there which may be effected.

Ultan Mulligan summarized the proceedings so far as follows:

Generic Messaging Development Paths

1. Maintain GMS as a mailbox management SCF – fix it if it is broken – decide on backwards compatibility issues on a per contribution basis. Build a new SCF for MMS and SMS and bring this to 3GPP.

2. Build a new SCF for MMS and SMS and bring it to 3GPP, which would eventually replace GMS in the ETSI spec.

3. Add basic new MMS and SMS functionality to GMS, plus fixes if it is broken (Scott's proposal) (do we bring this to 3GPP?)
   Build a new SCF for MMS and SMS and bring this to 3GPP.

4. Make major changes to GMS to build in full MMS and SMS support, as well as full fixes (make GMS asynchronous). Ignore backwards compatibility issues and fix or improve anything which is required. Bring GMS to 3GPP.

5. Make (mostly) backwards-compatible changes to GMS to add full MMS and GMS support, fix what is needed (replace or add synch and/or asynch methods on a case by case basis), and bring the result to 3GPP. Do not create new SCF.

Lucent would not like to have SCSs that have functional overlaps.

Today we have a functional overlap between GMS and UI. At present we have functional overlap between GCC and MPCC and other parts of the API. This gives developers choice and should not be seen as a problem.

If we add SMS or MMS support to Generic Messaging it is still not in 3GPP. If we do not bring this in to 3GPP then we do not need to add it!

- Take GMS accept Tdoc 332 –
- accept some Tdoc on added functionality such as the body part i.e. (Lucent Tdoc from Dublin) plus contribution support for asynchronous messaging
- These steps will not address the synchronous versus Asynchronous issue. This is basically choice 5 from Ultan's list above.

Anders and Scott accept this approach

Q: Does the Asynch versus Synch issue address the new additions or existing or both?

A: It applies to existing parts also.

At present no return parameters are provided in GMS.

Ericsson proposed that we accept option 2.

Proposal

Lucent wants Option 5 and Incomit agrees, so does IBM

Ericsson want to consider the Asynchronous support first and then consider Tdoc 332 and then maybe agree to option 5. The meeting agreed to this!!!!!!!!

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030340	Proposal to introduce a Messaging SCF in 3GPP Rel-6 - New Draft TS 29.198-15 V0.0.1	Ericsson (Erwin van Rijssen)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.

Due to the conversation we have had above we need to generally look at the contents of 340 and see if there are agreed parts that could be the subject of future contributions. This will be considered in conjunction with Tdoc 332.

This contribution basically provides text for a new SCF that caters for Multimedia messaging.

Things like list and Get Body parts seem to be the only areas not covered in the GMS SCS. So is Parsing the responsibility of the SCS or can it be done by the App?

We are not sure if this contributions functionality concerning 'Body Parts', is similar or the same as that in the Lucent Dublin contribution. It would of course be an advantage if they were.

Many of these methods that are similar in purpose to those in GMS are in fact enhanced and of course names are different.

The meeting generally agreed to the content of this new SCF. IBM stated that much of the same functionality is provided in Tdoc 332.

It was decided that before the next meeting Lucent, Ericsson and IBM will converse off line and bring a harmonised version in for consideration.

10 Other technical discussions OSA version 3 / 3GPP Rel.6

NOTE: No Rel-6 CR agreed by CN5 will be submitted to the next CN plenary (CN#21, Sep 2003).

10.1 Requirements

10.2 OSA support for 3GPP2 networks

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030341	Rel-6 OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks	Ericsson (Liliana Dinale)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030342	Rel-6 CR 29.198-01 OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 1 of OSA	Ericsson (Liliana Dinale)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 403
N5-030343	Rel-6 CR 29.198-02 OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 2 of OSA	Ericsson (Liliana Dinale)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 404
N5-030344	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 3 of OSA	Ericsson (Liliana Dinale)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 405
N5-030403	Rel-6 CR 29.198-01 OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 1 of OSA	Ericsson (Liliana Dinale)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed.
N5-030404	Rel-6 CR 29.198-02 OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 2 of OSA	Ericsson (Liliana Dinale)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed.
N5-030405	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 3 of OSA	Ericsson (Liliana Dinale)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed.

341 In order to acknowledge that OSA may be deployed not only in 3GPP UMTS networks, but also in 3GPP2 cdma2000 networks and to acknowledge 3GPP2 as alternative networks in which the application developers may make use of the OSA, it is proposed that an Annex D or E (informative), for each of the specifications involved, be inserted which is entitled "…for 3GPP2 cdma2000 networks"

These contributions consider 3GPP2 adoption of the 3GPP interfaces. 341 provides the generic text for all Parts of the 3GPP2 versions. 341 was Noted.

342 This text includes that of 341 and additionally defines the Exclusions and Exceptions, where differences exist between GSM and CDMA2000.

Whilst the stated text was agreed, there were some style problems identified with all of the documents. These problems will addressed by Liliana and reconsidered later in the week. Updated in 403, which was Agreed.

343 As above. Updated in 404, which was Agreed.

344 Clause 9 is a definition of service properties and not an explanation of their use.

As above. Updated in 405, which was Agreed.

10.3 Different abstraction levels for OSA

10.4 Presence and Availability Management

N5-030337	Extension of datatypes supported by TpAttribute	IBM, Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 406
N5-030406	Extension of datatypes supported by TpAttribute	IBM, Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed.

337

Section 5.1.22 needs to be updated with the correct ext.

Agreed with this change, updated to 406.

406

Reasons for change have been updated. In 5.1.13, the requested addition has been made to the last table element ("well formed"). "unsigned" has been removed from 5.1.22.

Agreed.

N5-030338	Correct description of TpAttributeType to adequately support possible types	IBM, Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Postponed
N5-030357	Correction to predefined attributes for Presentity Type	Teltier (Guda Venkatesh)	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Rejected. Document late. Needs further discussion. Postponed to next meeting.

338 Postponed for next meeting (note the dependency with 357).

N5-030355	Adding PAM service activation and deactivation	Teltier (Guda Venkatesh)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 400
N5-030400	Rel-6 CR 29.198-14 Add PAM service activation and deactivation (A proposal for satisfying 3GPP Presence requirements for the ability to activate/deactivate the presence service for a user)	Teltier (Guda Venkatesh)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	For email approval.

Presented in San Diego, got a comment it needed a new method to check if the method is active for the specified identity.

Comment: there is a NULL value in 8.1.1.5.

Comment: doc name says "NS" instead of "N5".

To be resubmitted next meeting. Guda wants to try to make it for this meeting – it will be 400, and addressed if there is time.

400

Not available during the meeting. For email approval.

N5-030356	Include provisioning SCF in Presence Service	Teltier (Guda Venkatesh)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 399 to remove history box
N5-030399	Rel-6 CR 29.198-14 Include provisioning SCF in Presence Service (Provisioning SCF added to Presence Service to satisfy 3GPP Presence requirements)	Teltier (Guda Venkatesh)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	For email approval.

These changes were agreed in San Diego but the CR was not ready for that meeting.

Change history needs to be updated. Also introductions etc will be moved to the CR front page, and the CR body will only contain the CR itself. Also an error – there is a NULL value, which cannot be implemented in CORBA.

To be updated to 399.

399

For email approval.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030398	SIP/SIMPLE to Presence Mapping	Teltier (Guda Venkatesh)	OSA 3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Postponed to next meeting.

Since we have already decided (and reported) to wait for CN1 before working on the PAM mapping, we can wait one more meeting for it.

Postponed to next meeting.

10.5 Call Control

10.6 Framework

N5-030320	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Allow Application to Resign (Re-submission of Dublin-approved N5-021150)	MCC (Ericsson)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 431
N5-030321	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Continued discussion on event notification extension (Re-submission of Bangkok-approved N5-030097)	MCC (Ericsson)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 432
N5-030322	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Extended User Status (Re-submission of SanDiego-approved N5-030284)	MCC (Ericsson)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 433
N5-030323	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Update Framework Spec with new TpServiceTypeName values (Re-submission of SanDiego-approved N5-030292)	MCC (Lucent)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 430
N5-030431	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Allow Application to Resign (Re-submission of Dublin-approved N5-021150)	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 320. Agreed.
N5-030432	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Continued discussion on event notification extension (Re-submission of Bangkok-approved N5-030097)	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 321. Agreed.
N5-030433	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Extended User Status (Re-submission of SanDiego-approved N5-030284)	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 322. Agreed.
N5-030430	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Update Framework with new TpServiceTypeName values	Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 323. Email agreed 8 Aug.

320

Resubmitted because

- the CR did not use the last version of the specification (changes should be applied to the last spec)
- category F: if they are error corrections then why only correcting Rel6? A correction is not a justification of a new release.

Submitter should be Ericsson and not CN5 as proposed.

This contribution cannot be approved as it is – it has been submitted by MCC as guidance.

For email approval (Erwin).

321, 322,

Same case as 320. For email approval (Erwin).

323

Same case as 320. For email approval (Musa).

N5-030389	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Missing Description for Service Super and Sub Types	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed (Cat B).
N5-030390	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Missing Support for Registration of Additional Service Property Types	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed (Cat B).

389

This was approved with changes in San Diego (210), and since there was no email approval afterwards there were never approved.

Corrections have been made as requested in San Diego and noted in the report.

Comment: should be catB not F. Will be changed by Adrian.

Agreed as CR cat B.

390

Same situation as for 389.

Agreed as CR cat B.

10.6.1 Migration support mechanism

10.6.2 Framework function for federation

10.7 Policy Management

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030339	Rel-6 CR 29.198-13 Extension of standard datatypes supported by TpPolicy	Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 407, which depends on 406
N5-030401	Feedback to N5-030339 TpPolicyAtomicType	Lucent and Teltier	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030402	Feedback to N5-030401 TpPolicyAtomicType	Telcordia (John-Luc Bakker)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030407	Rel-6 CR 29.198-13 Extension of standard datatypes supported by TpPolicy	Telcordia (John-Luc Bakker)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 339. Depends on 406. For email discussion/approval or potential Vote at the next meeting.
N5-030408	PM Interoperability Slides	Telcordia (John-Luc Bakker)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.

339

This contribution has been around for a while.

TpPolicyAtomicType is a copy of TpAttributeType, adding P_BOOLEAN. CR N5-030337 adds P_BOOLEAN to TpAttributeType. In order to prevent increasing the number of types in OSA common types have been defined. This CR proposes to use common type TpAttributeType rather than a custom copy for reasons of clarity to application developers, flexibility and ease of maintenance. Additionally, the type TpPolicyAtomicType does not allow customization through the (dreaded) SP_ rule. Hence, the current definition of TpPolicyAtomicType was found to restrictive and to implementation specific.

This contribution proposes to extend TpAttributeType with the CORBA standard primitive types, CORBA complex types, and an XML datatype, allowing any IDL or XML-expressable and verifiable datatype to be passed, including Boolean, Digit and Date. TpPolicyAtomicType only allows 4 types. TpPolicyAtomicType was found to restrictive and is replaced by the existing and common TpAttributeType. If not approved limited applicability of the Policy Management API; Policy Management API

cannot manage, e.g., currency amount based policies such that such policies are portable. Policy typing system not rigourously defined.

401 contains some comments on this contribution. Discussion continues there.

401

This document presents a number of review comments highlighting issues with the proposal contained in N5-030339, from the point of view of the Presence and Availability Management SCF and the Policy Management SCF, which are the main 'users' of the data type definitions that are proposed to be modified. From a PAM and PM perspective there is no problem in introducing new base types in TpAttribute or the SCF defined structured types, based on the recognized overlap. But how does one control what PAM or Policy implementations will need to implement whenever someone makes changes to TpAttribute? There needs to be a way for Policy or PAM SCFs to specify that a subset of those types are valid for any one version and include more as and when additional use cases are introduced for those types. In addition, the paper identifies issues with evaluation of XML types, specifically regarding the concept of XML equality. Consolidation should be limited to the overlap, and not extended beyond that.

Comment: 402 gives an answer to the concern on XML models.

Q: TpAttribute is very limited and not extendable. This limits the PM API. Also TpPolicyAtomicType guards a TpAny.

A: TpPolicyAtomicType is not meant for complex types – there are other mechanisms for this. Also TpPolicyAtomicType is not guarding TpAny, it is the other complex types that do.

Response: limitation is not only for lack of support of complex types, also for lack of support of simple types. Also TpPolicyAtomicType only guards TpAny, where in the spec is it otherwise?

Response: in the PM specs there is an Expression attribute which can be used to specify fragments of the rules. To support additional atomic types the contribution should also address this.

Discussion stops when meeting adjourn on Wednesday, then it is resumed on Thursday.

As a result of the Wednesday discussion is was agreed that 339 was not complete, and 407 was prepared with the missing parts.

A way forward is proposed:

Telcordia believes that applications using PM cannot be built independently of PM and its rule engine. As an example PAM is used – PAM that need policies stored. There must be a contract between the PAM application and the PM SCS, which is defined in the standard PM specs. To develop applications that use the PM APIs they need to be aware of the capabilities of the rules engine – which conditions and actions can be used for a policy. The PM engine needs to understand the conditions and actions, thus they need to be in the contract. Through XML schema these capabilities can be advertised in a standardized way – otherwise the PAM application cannot be independent of the PM SCF.

Q: where and how is the XML schema defined and incorporated?

A: references to the definitions of XML schemas have been provided.

Q: what are the steps necessary to incorporate the XML schema in the PM specs? What are the semantics? Where are the operations defined? A CR cannot just introduce a type without defining the semantics and the operations that can be with it.

A: XML can be converted into simple types and can be for instance represented in Java (there are tools for that), and can express capabilities of the PM API thus completing the description of the contract. It is a useful addition and doesn't bring additional types for, for example, for rule engine. If an implementation of any SCS cannot handle some data type there is a (platform specific and therefore available in every implementation) exception for it – this is used in the current PM implementation. Also XML as a means to complete the contract has been on the table for about one year now.

Q: the solution needs to be clearly understood, there are alternative approaches.

- How is an XML string parsed and validated?
- XML using conditions and actions need to be defined – generic ones are already defined in the PM, now those taking an XML string in the condition or action need to be defined.
- Need to specify how to use them together with others that don't use XML

Q: question to the meeting – is it agreed that a full contract should be defined between the application and the PM SCS?

Answer1: no need, can be done as a separate entity - using XML if wished, but out of the PM SCS. We don't believe the contract between should be fully specified.

Answer2: proposal to go for a vote next meeting.

Answer3: second the proposal above – vote whether we want to support an open interoperable solution: we need to vote the requirement before we discuss the solution.

After further discussion the meeting agrees that interoperability is desired, but it is still not clear whether there is an interoperability problem in the current PM specs.

The problem raised is in the capabilities of the PM rule engine – it can only understand a certain set of capabilities. Interoperability problem between applications and PM SCS because the application needs to understand what capabilities a rule engine supports.

Comment: the rule engine is not part of the specification.

Comment: the core of this is what interoperability is – only functional or not. In a broad sense of interoperability, the application should be able to discover the capabilities of the SCS. This is in agreement with the problem statement.

Q: where does the issue exactly arise in the case of PM?

A: unlike other SCSs PM assumes some functionality or behaviour that is not advertised as part of the API. In other SCSs behaviour is clear and all implementations behave in a predictable manner, in PM the behaviour should be visible (if not controllable).

Next meeting to vote whether there are interoperability issues in the current PM specs. Chelo to find out from Adrian how to do it.

The vote intends to answer the question whether there is an issue to solve. If the agreement is that there is, solutions will be discussed, 339 being one proposal.

10.8 User data Management and User data security management

10.9 Retrieval of Visited Network capabilities

10.10 Multimedia Messaging function

10.11 Enhanced user privacy in LCS

10.12 Access to IP Session information

10.13 User-application authentication function

10.14 Other APIs

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030329	Rel-6 CR29.198-05 Improve User Interaction message management functions	IBM (Scott Broussard)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 409
N5-030409r1	Rel-6 CR29.198-05 Improve User Interaction message management functions	IBM (Scott Broussard)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 329. Linked to 29.198-03 CR in 410. Email approved 20 Aug.

329 was presented in San Diego and got the comment that the adm features that are unrelated to the call should be in a separate interface in UI.

See 320 for discussion.

Updated to 409 for email approval (Scott).

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030330	Rel-6 CR29.198-03 Improve User Interaction message management functions	IBM (Scott Broussard)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 410
N5-030410	Rel-6 CR29.198-03 Improve User Interaction message management functions	IBM (Scott Broussard)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 330. Linked to 29.198-05 CR in 409r1. Email approved 20 Aug.

Update to the Framework to introduce a new TpServiceType name for the new interface in 329.

Q: this is adding a new SCF but 329 is really proposing adding a new interface in an existing SCF.

A: the Admin is conceptually a new interface because it does not inherit from the other interfaces, and it's registrable and discovery via the Framework. It's a new SCF in the same way as in Mobility – different SCF though same document.

Q: "reasons for change" are the same in 329 and 330.

A: because the motivation is the same. But agreed, it will be changed.

Q: since we're implementing the requirements for Rel6, do we have a requirement to expand UI with an administration interface?

A: it was originally proposed as a fix for Rel5 because the way it is now it doesn't work (very limited use) – the application can only play, not retrieve messages. The supported use was not all the originally intended functionality. We have very few requirements for UI, we have far more functionality than our very general requirements.

Comment: cover page needs update, and also content of both CRs, because it includes revision marks from previous changes (which are already incorporated in the last version of the specs). "Other specs affected" should also reflect the relationship between 320 and 321.

Q: the document structure in 329 does not reflect that these are two SCFs – they should be in different chapters, like the case of Location, where all chapters (sequence diagrams, class diagrams, etc) are split into as many parts as SCFs.

A: agreed.

Q: 329 proposes a change to IpUICall and IpAppUICall, not clear what is does.

A: IpUICall records the message and assigns the messageID to it. The application cannot do anything to it like including it in a database, or sending it in an email.

Q: the new interface can be used to get details about the message that has been recorded, so it is redundant functionality. Also the getMessageRequest in IpUICall does not interact with it, so it is not appropriate to have this functionality there.

A: we agreed in San Diego to do it like this i.e. the decision to have a separate interface for IpUIAdmin. (see 273 in San Diego report: "Split IpUIAdmin out to a new SCF Manager interface").

Q: would the behaviour in UICall be any different than that of deleteMessageRequest or recordMessageRequest?

Q: is there a use case for that?

A: are they the same sets of messageID? If separate, one set can be had for pre-defined messages, another for recorded. Agreed to reflect in the description of the method that in IpUICall it only affects recorded messages.

Updated to 410 for email approval (Scott).

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030331	Rel-6 CR29.198-05 User Interaction Speech functions	IBM (Scott Broussard)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 411
N5-030411r1	Rel-6 CR29.198-05 Update Generic User Interaction with speech recognition and synthesis functions	IBM (Scott Broussard)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 331. Email approved 20 Aug.

Was presented in San Diego and widely accepted except for the need to add some additional description to support voiceXML data to be sent as well as speech recognition done via the API.

Comment: as in the previous ones, changes that are already incorporated in the specs need to be accepted.

Comment: there are changes of two different colours. Need to have a single set.

Q: when a voiceXML string is sent, what is played to the user?

A: the contents of the voiceXML will define what happens to the user.

Q: not a good idea to extend this data type to each and every technology that we map to – this would mean changes for every southbound technology. VoiceXML should be implemented in a way that is technology independent.

A: this allows the application to interact with the user in a way that is independent of the voice technology. But voiceXML is also a standard, a higher-level mechanism, that can be used. Both approaches are enabled in this solution.

Updated to 411 for email approval (Scott).

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030365	Rel-6 29.198-06 Add terminal registration functions	Telcordia & NTT	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Rejected.

This contribution introduces new functionality; it enables personal mobility. It introduces the ability to receive notification of users registering with their terminals to the network. Additionally, a typo is fixed.

What is the motivation behind this contribution? And is there any relationship to the PAM spec? Telcordia is not aware of any relationship between the PAM spec and this contribution. It does however concern User Availability, which is part of the Presence capability – but agreed that Registration is not the same as Availability. How does this map to SIP based networks also? This does map to SIP based networks. How does this map to the IMS architecture? At the moment no mapping to IMS has been made. Ultan recommended that this become another interface. If this is being explored in 3GPP terms then either an existing requirement will need to be identified, or another proposed. regitrationReportRequest was suggested as an addition that might need to be made.

JL will re-consider this contribution and bring an updated version to the next meeting.

Rejected.

11 Organisational aspects with relation to Joint activities

11.1 CR tutorial

Ultan gave some guidelines on how to prepare CRs according to the 3GPP rules.

N5-030359	Change Request Instructions	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI Secretariat		Tdoc	Noted.

We need to be careful with the way we write CRs, and this is why Ultan has prepared these guidelines.

Instructions are available on the web site:

http://www.3gpp.org/specs/CR.htm

http://www.3gpp.org/specs/CR-Instructions.htm

3GPP TR 21.801: "Specification drafting rules".

3GPP TR 21.900: "Technical Specification Group working methods".

Some basic points when creating CRs:

1. One CR per physical document (i.e. one CR should never cover more than one release, or more than one part or sub-part of a specification.

2. Get the latest CR Cover Page. It is included in the zipped templates file, in the templates folder of the meeting to which you are submitting the CR. Use the one with the correct meeting details already filled in the header - prompt Adrian Zoicas for it if it hasn't been created yet. Get and use the style sheet also, it's called 3GPP_70.dot.

3. GET THE LATEST VERSION OF THE 3GPP SPEC YOU ARE CHANGING. For our specs, you can get them here: http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/Specs/html-info/29-series.htm
If you are making the first CR to create a new release, get the latest version of the previous release. If a CR gets postponed to a further meeting, and in the meantime a plenary updates the spec, the CR needs to be changed.

4. Follow the instructions in the CR cover page. Use the help notes hidden under the ⌘ symbols. Also read and follow the very simple instructions at the bottom of the CR cover page.

When filling out the CR cover page:

5. Please pay particular attention to getting the Spec number and version correct on the front page. This should be the spec number and version of the specification to be changed, i.e. which you have used to make your changes. And please pay attention to using the same spec number and release number in your file name (it's useful for other delegates if each file which contains a CR is entitled something like 'Rel-5 CR 29198-02...' or at least contains the spec number, the release number, and the fact that it is a CR in the file name).
This is the very first thing which is seen on a CR, it's the most basic information on the CR cover page, it is often reflected in the minutes, and is our best way of knowing what spec was intended to be changed. If this is wrong, should anyone trust the rest of the CR? And it's wrong surprisingly often.

6. Leave the CRNum and Revision fields blank - these will be assigned later by MCC – this is the way we do in this group: assigning number to a CR only when it is approved.

7. The Work Item code should correspond to the work item of the release you are changing, WITH ONE EXCEPTION: if it's a Category A CR, the work item code should be the same as the code in the base (category F) CR of which this Cat. A CR is a mirror.
The following are the work item codes which should be used for CN5:
OSA1: For Release 4 CRs
OSA2: For Release 5 CRs
OSA3: For Release 6 CRs

8. Date field should be in format dd/mm/yyyy. No other format should be used, as this field, along with the rest of the CR front page, is automatically parsed and fed into a CR database.

9. Please pay attention to the Category field. Use some common sense: you shouldn't use a Category F CR (essential correction) as grounds for making a new release version (e.g. creating Rel-6), you would use it to correct an existing release. Category D will almost certainly not be accepted, unless for a release not yet functionally closed (e.g. Rel-6 today). Category A is used in a later release when the CR corresponds to corrections in an earlier release (which are Cat. F). If more than what was in the original Cat. F CR is being changed, then it's not a mirror CR, so is not Cat. A.

10. The release should be the release to which the CR applies (the release of the spec which will result from the CR being implemented).
If it's a CR to a Version 5.x.x spec (Release 5), adding something or correcting something, then it's Rel-5.
If, however, the CR is to a version 5.x.x spec, but the CR is adding something to create Release 6, then it's a Rel-6 CR.
Use the codes exactly as identified (i.e. not Rel5 or R-5, but Rel-5)

11. Please fill in the Title, Reason and Summary of changes fields carefully. The 'Consequences if Not Approved' field is only required for a Cat. F CR. Be concise, but fill them in as if the acceptance or rejection of the CR depended on the information in these fields. In some ways, it does.

12. Do not go into lengthy description of the problem or justification of the chosen solution, neither in the CR header, nor in the opening paragraphs of the CR. Consider using an accompanying Tdoc. if you think this information is important.

13. In the Other Specs Affected field, identify other specs for which CRs have been or should be written, and which should be approved as a bundle with this CR.

Writing the CR:

14. Make the changes in the latest version of the spec. which you have downloaded. Use Word Revision Marks. Please do not include justifications or supporting documentation in the CR: just mark what you want changed:

exactly what you want changed.
Anything marked for deletion should already be in the specification, anything marked for addition will be added. Any text not marked will be ignored - it's assumed to be already in the spec.

Please note that we have dependencies inside our documents: adding or removing methods means changing class diagrams (OK, I can do that easier in the model than you can), changing the text in 2 places (interface table, and method description), plus also potentially changing sequence diagrams and STDs. Please cover all of these in your CR - the sequence diagrams are particularly important, as for some strange reason, developers use these as examples or recommended sequences of events.

The ETSI documents are not always identical to the 3GPP documents: there are differences (usually extra clauses) in parts 3, 4-2, 6, 14. Base the CR on the 3GPP spec - it will cover those parts common with the ETSI spec., but don't forget an accompanying Tdoc. to change the parts of the ETSI spec. if different. No need to duplicate the changes that are common.

15. Freeze the header field in the spec: open the header, Ctrl-A to select all the header, then Ctrl-Shift-F9 to freeze the text (normally the header is filled in from info from the spec. front page - when this is deleted as you make the CR, this info disappears and you're left with an 'Error...' field).
Headers are useful as a second way of verifying that you have used the latest version of the spec. Even if you know that there is no difference in the text you are changing between 2 different versions, at the CN Plenary they don't know. The wrong header is a sure signal that you've used the wrong version.
If you can't be bothered to freeze the header, then Adrian recommends to keep the history box from the spec in your CR (if you've done things in the right order, you'll not be pasting in the history box, but simply not deleting it!)

16. Having switched off Revision Marks, paste your CR cover page (Ctrl-A to select it all) into the spec just above your first change. Don't do it the other way around, i.e. pasting the spec into the CR cover page (you'll loose the headers).

17. Now, remove those parts of the spec. which are not relevant. We use automatic clause numbering in our specs, so you need to freeze the clause numbering before you delete - best way is to restart the clause numbering for the clause just following the clauses you will delete (right click on the clause title, select Bullets and Numbering, select Restart Numbering, and customise to set the number correctly. (If you're only changing one or two clauses, then switch off automatic numbering and number them manually).
While I can work out from the text in the clause which clause number it is, don't expect other delegates to do this.
If you leave gaps in the clause numbering, having removed parts of the spec between 2 changes, it's a good idea to indicate the next set of changes with something like:

←==========Next Set of Changes==========→

or

Change in Clause 12.3

18. If making a Category A CR, please don't just copy the Cat.F CR, changing the file name, cover page and headers. Apart from the fact that you'll almost certainly forget to change one of these things, surprisingly there are also some differences in our specs. from one release to the next (usually the reason why we created a new release). It's not so much work to create the new CR from scratch, especially when you already have identified the changes you will make.

Chelo to advertise these guidelines by email, not as attached doc but as email body.

11.2 First draft of Parlay X specifications

11.3 IETF RFCs

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030312	SP-030319 : IETF status report & 3GPP IETF Dependencies and Priorities	TSG CN Chairman	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Report	Noted.

Comment: CN5 also has a dependency on some of the presence staff. Jane to check and give feedback by email.

3rd party CC has got stuck in the IETF (some IPR problems). Our dependency is for the mapping TR, which is just a recommendation. Chelo to tell CN that our dependency is only for a TR, so the text saying "OSA cannot support IMS" might be too much, and to inform also CN of the results of Jane's AP above.

Noted.

11.4 Review of 3GPP OSA Work Plan

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030313	SP-030332 : Presentation of 3GPP Work Plan	MCC	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Report	Noted.

For info. OSA in slides 53 and 54. Chelo was part of the editing of these, introducing some corrections based on our report to the plenary.

Slide 78 shows the current conclusion with respect to Rel6 dates.

Noted.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030318	3GPP post-TSG#20 Work Plan	MCC	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.

Noted.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030319	3GPP post-TSG#20 Work Plan (filtered on CN5 work items)	MCC	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.

We need to give real feedback on this to the next plenary, so that completion dates can be discussed.

After discussion the following feedback is agreed:

- Deleted requirements need to be removed
- 22 and 25: change to 0% since we're not getting any support from SA2.
- 27 also 0% (no contributions to this requirement, it's been suggested to remove requirement)
- 26: change to 50%, completion March plenary
- 28 stays 40%, completion March plenary
- 29 stays 40%, %, completion March plenary
- 30 should be deleted (requirement has been deleted)
- 31 should be deleted (requirement has been deleted)
- 32 is more complete than 20% since we even have the docs – suggested 80%, completion date March plenary
- 33 proposed 90% (contribution agreed though not FW Rel6 yet), completion December plenary
- 34 also 0% (no contributions to this requirement, suggested to remove requirement)
- 35 is 0% (requirement may disappear)
- 36 proposed 90% (contribution agreed though not FW Rel6 yet), completion December plenary. Note: believed that current FW supports this requirement without changes.
- 37 also 0% (no reply from SA1, SA2).

Chelo to report these agreements to the CN Plenary.

Noted.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030327	Overview of 3GPP Release 5 - Summary of all Release 5 Features - Version 0.10	MCC	3 Reporting	Tdoc	Noted.

This document contains a high-level description of all 3GPP Release 5 Features. For each feature (or independent item), references are given to guide the reader to deepen the subject: the Work Item Description (WID) as well as the list of impacted specifications are provided in the beginning of the section describing the feature. Only the list of impacted specifications is provided here. The exact impact on a given specification due to a given feature is described by the Change Request (CR) list, which can be found at the end of the specification, or the CR database provides the full list of CRs for all 3GPP specifications.

Clause 12 is OSA.

Comments are welcome. Chelo to ask for email comments.

Noted.

11.5 3GPP OSA Work Item Description

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030324	DRAFT Revised Rel-6 Work Item Description for OSA Stage 3 (Updated CN#19-approved NP-030036)	MCC	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	WID	Noted.

Comment: in clause 10, the Parlay X specifications should be mentioned. Also the PAM mapping. Chelo to tell Adrian about this.

Noted.

N5-030368	TSG CN WG5 Work Items	MCC	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.

Noted.

11.6 Organization of further work on ETSI ES 201 915 (Version 2)

N5-030360	Implementing Backwards Compatibility Policy	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI Secretariat		Tdoc	Ultan to kick-off email discussion.

When the backwards compatibility process was introduced, we indicated that we would maintain deprecated methods in the specification for one full release. With the preparation of Parlay 5.0, it is time now to decide what to do with those methods deprecated in Parlay 4.0. Four alternative approaches are offered, with varying consequences on our specifications. One needs to be chosen.

Our backwards compatibility mechanisms have been in operation for at least one year so far, and appear to be working well. We have a clear set of rules identifying what it is we can and cannot change in our specifications to ensure old applications can work with new versions of SCFs. We have a number of deprecated methods in most specifications, identified by the <<deprecated>> stereotype, and clearly identify new methods with a <<new>> stereotype. It was decided then that we should keep the old methods for 1 full release.

Parlay 3.3 appeared after Parlay 4.0, and corresponds in time to Parlay 4.1. Therefore, deleting in Parlay 5.0 all Parlay 3.x deprecated methods would mean deleting methods which have been deprecated for the first time in Parlay 3.3, i.e. deprecated for the first time last March. This is clearly not acceptable.

Nor is it acceptable to attempt to count the time that deprecated methods remain in the specification.

Some alternatives:

Alternative 1:

In Parlay 5.0, we remove any methods tagged as <<deprecated>> in Parlay 4.0, and remove the <<new>> tags from any <<new>> methods in Parlay 4.0. Anything which was deprecated or added after Parlay 4.0, retains their deprecated or new status for all of Parlay 5.

For Parlay 6.0, we remove any method tagged as <<deprecated>> in Parlay 5.0, and remove the <<new>> tags for any <<new>> methods in Parlay 5.0. This is where we get rid of those methods deprecated in Parlay 4.1, 4.2 (and 3.3, since that corresponds to 4.1 in time) etc.

We only remove deprecated methods and <<new>> stereotypes on a major release, never on a minor release.

Consequences: methods remain in the specification for at least one full release. The methods which get deleted fastest are those which are in an x.0 release. I.e. Parlay 4.0 deprecated methods are deleted in Parlay 5.0. Parlay 4.1, Parlay 4.2 deprecated methods are deleted in Parlay 6.0. But if Parlay 4.3 is issued, it will appear later than Parlay 5.0 (which appears with Parlay 4.2), so any methods newly deprecated in 4.3 will not have been deprecated in 5.0, and so will not be deleted in 6.0, but in 7.0.

This alternative is quite easy to manage, as it is simply a case of opening the Parlay 4.0 specification, and removing all methods indicated in 4.0 as deprecated from the Parlay 5.0 model, and removing all <<new>> tags in 4.0 from the Parlay 5.0 model. Or, in terms of the ETSI specifications, any methods deprecated in the first issue of ES 202 915 (Parlay 4.0) get deleted in the first issue of ES 203 915 (Parlay 5.0).

The most immediate consequence for us would be the removal of methods such as initiateAuthentication(), selectEncryptionMethod() and authenticate() from the Framework, since all the old, Parlay 3 access and authentication methods were deprecated for the first time in Parlay 4.0. 10 methods would be deleted from the Framework, 1 from MPCC and 2 from DSC.

Alternative 2:

In Parlay 5.0, we remove any methods tagged as <<deprecated>>, and remove the <<new>> tags from any <<new>> methods in the spec prior to Parlay 4.0 (in our case, Parlay 3.2).

For Parlay 6.0, we remove any method tagged as <<deprecated>> and remove the <<new>> tags from any <<new>> methods in the spec prior to Parlay 5.0 (in our case, Parlay 4.1).

Again, we only remove deprecated methods and <<new>> stereotypes on a major release, never on a minor release.

Consequences: Methods remain in the specification for well over 1 release, up to 2 full releases. Parlay 4.0, 4.1 deprecated methods get deleted in Parlay 6.0. Parlay 4.2, which is not prior to Parlay 5.0, would have its deprecated methods deleted in Parlay 7.0. If Parlay 4.3 and 5.1 come before Parlay 6.0, then it they would have their deprecated methods deleted in Parlay 7.0.

The difference with Alternative 1 is essentially with the x.0 version: The deprecated methods in Parlay 4.0 or 5.0 get deleted faster in Alternative 1 than in Alternative 2.

The immediate consequences for us would be: none. For 5.0, we would delete any methods which were deprecated in the specification prior to 4.0, i.e. in 3.2 But there were no deprecated methods in 3.2 - we started using our backwards compatibility mechanism in 4.0!

Alternative 3:

A mix of both: use the timescale in Alternative 1 to remove the <<new>> tags, and use the timescale in Alternative 2 to remove the deprecated methods. So the <<new>> tags get removed faster than the deprecated methods.

Consequences: the purpose of this alternative is to have fewer <<new>> methods, integrating them more in the specification, while not deleting the deprecated ones quite so quickly.

Alternative 4:

Do nothing. Reverse our earlier decision. Preserve backwards compatibility absolutely by never deleting methods.

Consequences: really BC, but dirty spec.

No matter the alternative, the process to follow is CRs, which allows for everybody to discuss each and every method that may disappear..

Before closing Parlay 5 (that is, before next meeting), we need a decision to it. If we do nothing it should be as an agreement. A decision is necessary before next meeting because depending on the decisions different CRs may be necessary).

Comment: is Parlay 5 closing in October? That would be before the end of 3GPP Rel6. This would mean that the extra functionality of Parlay 5 would be very small.

Q: does this happen in other parts of the 3GPP specs? How is this done in for example CAMEL?

A: everything is carried forward.

Q: do we make a decision to work in a different way than the others?

A: we're masters of the contents of our own specs, dealing with BC is up to us. The CN plenary has already approved our deprecation system.

Ultan to kick-off an email discussion on this.

11.7 Organization of further work on ETSI TR 101 917

12 Outgoing Liaisons

None.

13 Future meetings

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030316	Full 3GPP meeting calendar including workshops	MCC	Future meetings	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030317	SA_SA5_CN_CN5 meeting calendar	MCC	Future meetings	Tdoc	Noted.

Noted.

CN1-4 meet on 27-31, probably Bangkok ; Parlay is planning the next meeting the following week, in Rome.

Concerns that some delegates would have to travel the two weeks, and one of them far.

Agreed that meetings co-located with Parlay mean for the JWG that we have a very fragmented meeting – lots of time spent in joint sessions, and delegates going to other groups.

Concerns that we haven't had a meeting in Europe for a while.

Next Parlay meeting is proposed November 3-6, waiting for the JWG management to give feedback.

Agreement:

- We'll join CN1-4 February meeting in Europe.
- We won't join in principle CN1-4 May meeting, try to co-locate with Parlay. If co-locating with Parlay is not possible, we'll co-locate with the CN1-4.
- August CN1-4 in principle yes we join.
- November: try with Parlay again.

Chelo to contact the Parlay Board and request from them information about next year's meetings, **before the September plenary**. The idea is for the JWG to have a meeting calendar for next year. Chelo to inform the CN Plenary of this agreed meeting calendar.

TITLE	DATES	LOCATION	CTRY
3GPPCN#21	17 - 19 Sep 2003	Frankfurt	DE
3GPPCN5#25	27 - 31 Oct 2003	Bangkok	TH
3GPPCN#22	10 - 12 Dec 2003	Hawaii	US
3GPPCN5#26	16 - 20 Feb 2004	TBD	
3GPPCN#23	10 - 12 Mar 2004	TBC	US
3GPPCN5#27	10 - 14 May 2004 (TBD - Parlay ?)	TBD	
3GPPCN#24	2 - 4 Jun 2004	KOREA	KR
3GPPCN5#28	16 - 20 Aug 2004	Sophia Antipolis	FR
3GPPCN#25	8 - 10 Sep 2004	US	US
3GPPCN5#29	15 - 19 Nov 2004 (TBD - Parlay ?)	TBD	
3GPPCN#26	8 - 10 Dec 2004	Athens	GR

14 AOB

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030366	Autumn edition of ETSI Mobile News	MCC	AOB	Tdoc	Noted.

Chelo has proposed the Parlay MarCom to will write this article, and they have accepted. Chelo to put in touch both Parlay MarCom and the editor of ETSI Mobile News.

Noted.

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030367	TSG CN WG5 Specifications	MCC	AOB	Tdoc	Noted.

15 Close

On behalf of the JWG participants, the CN5 Chair, Chelo ABARCA, thanked the host 3GPP2 for the good arrangements.

Annex A: Agenda

1 Opening of the meeting and approval of the agenda (Monday 9:00 AM)
1.1 IPR (Intellectual Property Rights) declarations

2 Allocation of documents to agenda items

3 Reporting
3.1 JWG meeting, San Diego

3.2 3GPP
3.2.1 CN plenary
3.2.2 SA plenary
3.2.3 SA1 activities on OSA Requirements
3.2.4 SA1 and T2 activities on MMS
3.2.5 SA2 activities on IP Session Function
3.2.6 SA2 activities on User Data Management
3.2.7 CN1 activities on Access Independence
3.2.8 CN1 activities on Presence

3.3 Parlay
3.3.1 Parlay Board
3.3.2 Parlay TAC

3.4 ETSI
3.4.1 ETSI SPAN reorganization
3.4.2 STF 211

3.5 3GPP2

3.6 Work between meetings
This agenda item aims to review the ToDo list from the previous meeting, plus reporting on any other between-meetings activity, if applicable.

3.7 Others

4 Input liaison statements

5 Technical discussions OSA version 1 / 3GPP Rel.4
Only essential error corrections can be taken into account. Essential means that without the intended error correction the current spec cannot be implemented (SCS and/or application side).

Note that as Parlay 3.2 has been finalised, and backwards compatibility has to be guaranteed, the assumption is that for error corrections in the scope of Parlay 3 / 3GPP Rel.4 only work around and documentation of the errors is allowed.

6 Technical discussions OSA version 2 / 3GPP Rel.5
Only essential error corrections can be taken into account. Essential means that without the intended error correction the current spec cannot be implemented (SCS and/or application side).

Note that as Parlay 4.0 has been finalised, and backwards compatibility has to be guaranteed, the assumption is that for error corrections in the scope of Parlay 4 / 3GPP Rel.5 only work around and documentation of the errors is allowed.

7 Framework session
Do we need a FW session? HA? Anything else?

8 Policy Management Session
Do we need a PM session? I don't think so

9 PAM session

Do we need a PAM session? I don't think so

10 Parlay X session

Do we need a PX session? We could discuss status plus the template proposed by Joe if he's available

11 Messaging session

Can we have one? Will Gareth (no), Koen (or would Erwin replace him) and Scott be in the meeting?

12 Other technical discussions OSA version 3 / 3GPP Rel.6

12.1 Requirements

Please somebody has the last list of SA1 reqs handy to update this?

12.2 Different abstraction levels for OSA
12.3 Presence and Availability Management
12.4 Call Control
12.5 Framework
12.5.1 Migration support mechanism
12.5.2 Framework function for federation
12.6 Policy Management
12.7 User data Management and User data security management
12.8 Retrieval of Visited Network capabilities
12.9 Multi Media Messaging function
12.10 Enhanced user privacy in LCS
12.11 Access to IP Session information
12.12 User-application authentication function
12.13 Other APIs

13 Organisational aspects with relation to Joint activities
13.1 CR tutorial
13.2 First draft of Parlay X specifications
13.3 IETF RFCs
13.4 Review of 3GPP OSA work plan
13.5 3GPP OSA Work Item Description.
13.6 Organization of further work on ETSI ES 201 915 (Version 2)
13.7 Organization of further work on ETSI TR 101 917
14 Outgoing Liaisons

15 Future meetings
16 AOB
17 Close

Annex B: Documents list

	Document not available				
	Document available, not yet treated				
	Document available late, not yet treated				
	Document treated				
	Document replaced / superseded by a Revised Version				
	CN5#24, San Francisco, CA, USA, 14-18 July 2003				
Doc	**Title**	**Source**	**Allocations**	**Type**	**Status/Abstract**
N5-030107	Draft Report of CN5#23, San Diego, CA, USA, 19-23 May 2003	JWG Chair	3. Reporting	Report	Approved
N5-030108	Report of CN5#23, San Diego, CA, USA, 19-23 May 2003	JWG	3. Reporting	Report	Approved
N5-030212	Add ability to identify when a client app/service contract/service profile is being used	Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Rejected. Needs clarification
N5-030213	Enterprise Operator should have access to Event Notification	Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Rejected. Needs clarification
N5-030214	Introduce a ServiceID field to TpServiceProfileDescription	Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Not discussed without the author.
N5-030215	Clarify situation with service contracts and profiles	Open API Solutions	Parlay 3/4	Tdoc	Rejected.
N5-030216	Clarify behaviour when deleting contracts/profiles/client apps	Open API Solutions	Parlay 3/4	Tdoc	Agreed.
N5-030217	Clarify erroneous field in TpServiceProfileDescription	Open API Solutions	Parlay 3/4	Tdoc	Rejected. The problem is agreed but not the solution.
N5-030218	Add events to allow an entop to identify when a client app/service contract/service profile is being used	Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Not discussed without the author.
N5-030219	The role of the activity timer needs to be clarified	Open API Solutions	Parlay 3/4	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030220	Rel 4 - Make more explicit when the call control activity timer should be stopped in UI.	Open API Solutions	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Rejected.
N5-030221	Rel 5 - Make more explicit when the call control activity timer should be stopped in UI.	Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Rejected.
N5-030222	Rel 5 - Unnecessary method calls needed after continueProcessing.	Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Rejected. Needs more discussion
Doc	**Title**	**Source**	**Allocations**	**Type**	**Status/Abstract**
N5-030300	Draft Agenda	JWG Chair	1 Agenda approval	Agenda	Approved.
N5-030301	Document Allocation	JWG Chair	2 Tdoc# allocation	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030302	report_Monday	JWG Chair	n.a.	Report	Noted.
N5-030303	report_Tuesday	JWG Chair	n.a.	Report	Noted.
N5-030304	report_Wednesday	JWG Chair	n.a.	Report	Noted.
N5-030305	report_Thursday	JWG Chair	n.a.	Report	Noted.
N5-030306	report_Friday	JWG Chair	n.a.	Report	Noted.
N5-030307R2	Draft Report of CN5#24	JWG Chair	n.a.	Report	Dispatched 14 Aug. Revised 9 Sep.
N5-030308	Report of CN5#24	CN5	n.a.	Report	For approval at CN#25, Oct 2003
N5-030309	Report of last 3GPP CN meeting	CN Chair	3 Reporting	Report	Noted.
N5-030310	Report of last 3GPP SA meeting	MCC	3 Reporting	Report	Noted.
N5-030310r1	Report of last 3GPP SA meeting v004	MCC	3 Reporting	Report	Noted.
N5-030311	SA1 report to SA#20	SA1	3 Reporting	Report	Noted.
N5-030312	SP-030319 : IETF status report & 3GPP IETF Dependencies and Priorities	TSG CN Chairman	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Report	Noted.
N5-030313	SP-030332 : Presentation of 3GPP Work Plan	MCC	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Report	Noted.
N5-030314	TR 21.902 V1.1.01(2003-06) Evolution of 3GPP System	3GPP future evolution workshop at SA#20	3 Reporting	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030315	3GPP-OMA Workshop, 15th September 2003	MCC	3 Reporting	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030316	Full 3GPP meeting calendar including workshops	MCC	Future meetings	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030317	SA_SA5_CN_CN5 meeting calendar	MCC	Future meetings	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030318	3GPP post-TSG#20 Work Plan	MCC	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030319	3GPP post-TSG#20 Work Plan (filtered on CN5 work items)	MCC	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030320	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Allow Application to Resign (Re-submission of Dublin-approved N5-021150)	MCC (Ericsson)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 431
N5-030321	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Continued discussion on event notification extension (Re-submission of Bangkok-approved N5-030097)	MCC (Ericsson)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 432
N5-030322	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Extended User Status (Re-submission of SanDiego-approved N5-030284)	MCC (Ericsson)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 433
N5-030323	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Update Framework Spec with new TpServiceTypeName values (Re-submission of SanDiego-approved N5-030292)	MCC (Lucent)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 430

N5-030324	DRAFT Revised Rel-6 Work Item Description for OSA Stage 3 (Updated CN#19-approved NP-030036)	MCC	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	WID	Noted.
N5-030325	ETSI: CL 2258 - Call for Experts for Specialist Task Force MN (ETSI/SPAN) on Conformance Test Specifications to Support the API for Open Service Access Version 2	ETSI	3 Reporting	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030326	OMA Dependencies - for 3GPP WG review	MCC	3 Reporting	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030327	Overview of 3GPP Release 5 - Summary of all Release 5 Features - Version 0.10	MCC	3 Reporting	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030328	ETSI: CL 2262 - The new Technical Committee formed by the combination of TC SPAN and EP TIPHON	ETSI	3 Reporting	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030329	Rel-6 CR29.198-05 Improve User Interaction message management functions	IBM	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 409
N5-030330	Rel-6 CR29.198-03 Improve User Interaction message management functions	IBM	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 410
N5-030331	Rel-6 CR29.198-05 User Interaction Speech functions	IBM	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 411
N5-030332	Rel-5 ES202195-09 Correct GMS Messaging Problems	IBM	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030333	Rel-6 ES202195-09 Correct GMS Messaging Problems	IBM	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030334	Decide whether Acct Mgr changes should address Rel-5	IBM	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Noted. Changes are necessary to Account management to support Parlay X, which is Rel-6, however it is intended to be supportable on Rel-5, which would also require these changes
N5-030335	Rel-5 CR29.198-11 Update Account Management to enable Parlay X	IBM	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Rejected.
N5-030336	Rel-6 CR29-198-11 Update Account Management to enable Parlay X	IBM	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed.
N5-030337	Extension of datatypes supported by TpAttribute	IBM, Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 406
N5-030338	Correct description of TpAttributeType to adequately support possible types	IBM, Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Postponed
N5-030339	Extension of standard datatypes supported by TpPolicy	Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 407, which depends on 406
N5-030340	Proposal to introduce a Messaging SCF in 3GPP Rel-6 - New Draft TS 29.198-15 V0.0.1	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030341	Rel-6 OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030342	Rel-6 CR 29.198-01 OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 1 of OSA	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 403
N5-030343	Rel-6 CR 29.198-02 OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 2 of OSA	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 404
N5-030344	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 3 of OSA	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 405
N5-030345	Rel 4 CR 29.198-04 - update incorrect superviseRes description	Open API Solutions	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed.
N5-030346	Update incorrect MMCC superviseCallRes description	Open API Solutions	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	Tdoc	Approved.
N5-030347	Update incorrect MMCC method references	Open API Solutions	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	Tdoc	Agreed. Rel-5 Mirror CR in 351.
N5-030348	Rel 5 CR 29.198-04-2 - update incorrect GCC superviseCallRes description	Open API Solutions	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed. Needs CR Cat A.
N5-030349	Rel 5 CR 29.198-04-3 - update incorrect MPCC superviseCallRes description	Open API Solutions	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed. Needs CR Cat A.
N5-030350	Rel 5 CR 29.198-04-4 - update incorrect MMCC superviseVolumeRes description	Open API Solutions	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed. Needs CR Cat A.
N5-030351	Rel 5 CR 29.198-04-4 - update incorrect MMCC method references	Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Agreed. Rel-5 Mirror of 347.
N5-030352	Corrections to CCC	Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	1, 3 agreed, 2 not agreed. Update the maturity table (Richard)
N5-030353	Discuss MMCC criteria overlap and activity timer text	Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Rejected.
N5-030354	Application HA using Callbacks	AePONA	Rel-4, Rel-5	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030355	Adding PAM service activation and deactivation	Teltier	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 400
N5-030356	Include provisioning SCF in Presence Service	Teltier	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 399 to remove history box
N5-030357	Correction to predefined attributes for Presentity Type	Teltier	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Rejected. Document late. Needs further discussion. Postponed to next meeting
N5-030358	Void				
N5-030359	Change Request Instructions	ETSI		Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030360	Implementing Backwards Compatibility Policy	ETSI		Tdoc	Ultan to kick-off email discussion.
N5-030361	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-4 Correction to TpAudioCapabiltiesType and	ETSI	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Agreed

	TpVideoCapabilitiesType to include full set of 3GPP codecs				
N5-030362	Rel-6 CR 29.198-04-4 Correction to TpAudioCapabiltiesType and TpVideoCapabilitiesType to include full set of 3GPP codecs	ETSI	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed
N5-030363	Application HA Discussion (email thread)	AePONA	Rel-4, Rel-5	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030364	Service Integrity Management	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030364r1	Service Integrity Management - Use cases requiring support of Integrity Management at a service level in addition to current service instance level	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030365	Rel-6 29.198-06 Add terminal registration functions	Telcordia & NTT	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Rejected.
N5-030366	Autumn edition of ETSI Mobile News	MCC	AOB	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030367	TSG CN WG5 Specifications	MCC	AOB	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030368	TSG CN WG5 Work Items	MCC	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030369	Parlay X formatted as ETSI Specification	ETSI	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	TS	Noted.
N5-030370	Parlay X formatted as a 3GPP Specification	ETSI	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	TS	Noted.
N5-030371	List of REGISTERED participants	MCC	1 Agenda approval	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030372	Inconsistency with the definition of UserInteractionAborted	Marconi Communications	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	Tdoc	Agreed. Results in 2 Rel 4/5 CRs: 391, 392
N5-030373	Report on status of Access Independence and Presence work in CN1	Marconi Communications	3 Reporting	Report	Noted
N5-030374	The different values of TpReleaseCause between MPCC and GCC	NTT	Rel-4, Rel-5, Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030375	Rel 4 CR 29.198-12 Charging State Correction	AePONA	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Updated to 394
N5-030376	Rel 5 CR 29.198-12 Charging State Correction	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Updated to 395
N5-030377	Rel 4 CR 29.198-5 Response Requested Correction	AePONA	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Updated to 396
N5-030378	Rel 5 CR 29.198-5 responseRequested Correction	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Updated to 397
N5-030379	Rel 5 CR 29.198-2 Java Realisation Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update to 412, 413
N5-030380	Rel 5 CR 29.198-3 Java Realisation Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update to 414
N5-030381	Rel 5 CR 29.198-4-1 Java Realisation Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update to 415
N5-030382	Rel 5 CR 29.198-4-2 Java Realisation Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update to 416
N5-030383	Rel 5 CR 29.198-4-3 Java Realisation Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update to 417
N5-030384	Rel 5 CR 29.198-4-4 Java Realisation Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update to 418
N5-030385	Rel 5 CR 29.198-4-5 Java Realisation Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update to 419
N5-030386	Void				
N5-030387	Summary of the San Diego discussion on Messaging	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted
N5-030388	Response to N5-030340 Proposal to introduce a Messaging SCF in 3GPP Rel-6 - New Draft TS 29.198-15 V0.0.1	MCC	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted
N5-030389	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Missing Description for Service Super and Sub Types	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed (Cat B).
N5-030390	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Missing Support for Registration of Additional Service Property Types	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed (Cat B).
N5-030391	Rel 4 CR 29.198-2 Remove inconsistency with the definition of UserInteractionAborted	Marconi Communications	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	For email approval.
N5-030392	Rel 5 CR 29.198-2 Remove inconsistency with the definition of UserInteractionAbortedInconsistency with the definition of UserInteractionAborted	Marconi Communications	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	For email approval.
N5-030393	ETSI Requirements Specification	BT	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	TDoc	Latest update taking into account San Diego JWG's comments & ETSI SPAN approved
N5-030394	Rel 4 CR 29.198-12 Correction of Charging State transition	AePONA	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed.
N5-030395	Rel 5 CR 29.198-12 Correction of Charging State transition	AePONA	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed.
N5-030396	Rel 4 CR 29.198-5 Correction of responseRequested behaviour and sendInfoRes	AePONA	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed.
N5-030397	Rel 5 CR 29.198-5 Correction of responseRequested behaviour and sendInfoRes	AePONA	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed.
N5-030398	SIP/SIMPLE to Presence Mapping	Teltier	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Postponed to next meeting.
N5-030399	Rel-6 CR 29.198-14 Include provisioning SCF in Presence Service (Provisioning SCF added to Presence Service to satisfy 3GPP Presence requirements)	Teltier	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	For email approval.
N5-030400	Rel-6 CR 29.198-14 Add PAM service activation and deactivation (A proposal for satisfying 3GPP Presence requirements for the ability to activate/deactivate the presence service for a user)	Teltier	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	For email approval.
N5-030401	Feedback to N5-030339 TpPolicyAtomicType	Lucent and Teltier	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted
N5-030402	Feedback to N5-030401 TpPolicyAtomicType	Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted
N5-030403	Rel-6 CR 29.198-01 OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 1 of OSA	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed.
N5-030404	Rel-6 CR 29.198-02 OSA API Support for 3GPP2	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed.

	networks in Part 2 of OSA				
N5-030405	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 3 of OSA	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed.
N5-030406	Rel-6 CR 29.198-02 Extension of datatypes supported by TpAttribute	IBM, Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed.
N5-030407	Rel-6 CR 29.198-13 Extension of standard datatypes supported by TpPolicy	Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 339. Depends on 406. For email discussion/approval or potential Vote at the next meeting.
N5-030408	PM Interoperability Slides	Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030409r1	Rel-6 CR 29.198-05 Improve User Interaction message management functions	IBM	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 329. Linked to 29.198-03 CR in 410. Email approved 20 Aug.
N5-030410	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Improve User Interaction message management functions	IBM	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 330. Linked to 29.198-05 CR in 409r1. Email approved 20 Aug.
N5-030411r1	Rel-6 CR 29.198-05 Update Generic User Interaction with speech recognition and synthesis functions	IBM	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 331. Email approved 20 Aug.
N5-030412	Rel-5 CR 29.198-01 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 379. Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030413	Rel-5 CR 29.198-02 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 379. Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030414	Rel-5 CR 29.198-03 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 380. Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030415	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-1 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 381. Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030416	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-2 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 382. Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030417	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-3 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 383. Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030418	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-4 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 384. Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030419	ES 202 915-4-5 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Update of 385. For email approval.
N5-030420	Rel-5 CR 29.198-05 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030421	Rel-5 CR 29.198-06 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030422	Rel-5 CR 29.198-07 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030423	Rel-5 CR 29.198-08 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030424	ES 202 915-9 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	For email approval.
N5-030425	ES 202 915-10 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	For email approval.
N5-030426	Rel-5 CR 29.198-11 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030427	Rel-5 CR 29.198-12 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030428	Rel-5 CR 29.198-13 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030429	Rel-5 CR 29.198-14 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030430	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Update Framework with new TpServiceTypeName values	Lucent	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 323. Email approved 8 Aug.
N5-030431	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Allow for applications to re-obtain the reference to the service manager (Re-submission of Dublin-approved N5-021150)	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 320. Agreed.
N5-030432	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Add support in OSA to inform applications about new SCSs and their level of Backward compatibility – Alignment with 22.127 (Re-submission of Bangkok-approved N5-030097)	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 321. Agreed.
N5-030433	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Addition of “Extended User Status” as service type name - Alignment with 29.198-06 (Re-submission of SanDiego-approved N5-030284)	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 322. Agreed.

B.1 List of CN5-agreed CRs

	CN5#24, San Francisco, CA, USA, 14-18 July 2003					
Doc	**Title**	**Source**	**Allocations**	**Type**	**Status/Abstract**	**Go to CN#21**
N5-030336	Rel-6 CR 29-198-11 Update Account Management to enable Parlay X	IBM (Scott Broussard)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed.	**No**
N5-030345	Rel 4 CR 29.198-04 Update incorrect superviseRes description	Open API Solutions (Gareth Carroll)	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed.	**No**
N5-030348	Rel 5 CR 29.198-04-2 Update incorrect GCC superviseCallRes description	Open API Solutions (Gareth Carroll)	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed. Needs CR Cat A.	**No**
N5-030349	Rel 5 CR 29.198-04-3 Update incorrect MPCC superviseCallRes description	Open API Solutions (Gareth Carroll)	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed. Needs CR Cat A.	**No**
N5-030350	Rel 5 CR 29.198-04-4 Update incorrect MMCC superviseVolumeRes description	Open API Solutions (Gareth Carroll)	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed. Needs CR Cat A.	**No**
N5-030351	Rel 5 CR 29.198-04-4 Update incorrect MMCC method references	Open API Solutions (Gareth Carroll)	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Agreed.	**No**
N5-030361	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-4 Correction to TpAudioCapabiltiesType and TpVideoCapabilitiesType to include full set of 3GPP codecs	ETSI (Ultan Mulligan)	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Agreed	**No**
N5-030362	Rel-6 CR 29.198-04-4 Correction to TpAudioCapabiltiesType and TpVideoCapabilitiesType to include full set of 3GPP codecs	ETSI (Ultan Mulligan)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed	**No**
N5-030389	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Missing Description for Service Super and Sub Types	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed (Cat B).	**No**
N5-030390	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Missing Support for Registration of Additional Service Property Types	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed (Cat B).	**No**
N5-030391	Rel 4 CR 29.198-02 Remove inconsistency with the definition of UserInteractionAborted	Marconi Communications	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	For email approval.	**No**
N5-030392	Rel 5 CR 29.198-02 Remove inconsistency with the definition of UserInteractionAbortedInconsistency with the definition of UserInteractionAborted	Marconi Communications	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	For email approval.	**No**
N5-030394	Rel 4 CR 29.198-12 Correction of Charging State transition	AePONA	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed.	**No**
N5-030395	Rel 5 CR 29.198-12 Correction of Charging State transition	AePONA	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed.	**No**
N5-030396	Rel 4 CR 29.198-05 Correction of responseRequested behaviour and sendInfoRes	AePONA	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed.	**No**
N5-030397	Rel 5 CR 29.198-05 Correction of responseRequested behaviour and sendInfoRes	AePONA	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Agreed.	**No**
N5-030399	Rel-6 CR 29.198-14 Include provisioning SCF in Presence Service (Provisioning SCF added to Presence Service to satisfy 3GPP Presence requirements)	Teltier (Guda Venkatesh)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	For email approval.	**No**
N5-030400	Rel-6 CR 29.198-14 Add PAM service activation and deactivation (A proposal for satisfying 3GPP Presence requirements for the ability to activate/deactivate the presence service for a user)	Teltier (Guda Venkatesh)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	For email approval.	**No**
N5-030403	Rel-6 CR 29.198-01 OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 1 of OSA	Ericsson (Liliana Dinale)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed.	**No**
N5-030404	Rel-6 CR 29.198-02 OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 2 of OSA	Ericsson (Liliana Dinale)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed.	**No**
N5-030405	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 3 of OSA	Ericsson (Liliana Dinale)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed.	**No**
N5-030406	Rel-6 CR 29.198-02 Extension of datatypes supported by TpAttribute	IBM, Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Agreed.	**No**
N5-030407	Rel-6 CR 29.198-13 Extension of standard datatypes supported by TpPolicy	Telcordia (John-Luc Bakker)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 339. Depends on 406. For email discussion/approval or potential Vote at the next meeting.	**No**
N5-030409r1	Rel-6 CR 29.198-05 Improve User Interaction message management functions	IBM (Scott Broussard)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 329. Linked to 29.198-03 CR in 410. Email approved 20 Aug.	**No**
N5-030410	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Improve User Interaction message management functions	IBM (Scott Broussard)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 330. Linked to 29.198-05 CR in 409r1. Email approved 20 Aug.	**No**
N5-030411r1	Rel-6 CR 29.198-05 Update Generic User Interaction with speech recognition and synthesis functions	IBM (Scott Broussard)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 331. Email approved 20 Aug.	**No**
N5-030412	Rel-5 CR 29.198-01 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 379. Email agreed 8 Sep.	**Yes**

N5-030413	Rel-5 CR 29.198-02 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 379. Email agreed 8 Sep.	**Yes**
N5-030414	Rel-5 CR 29.198-03 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 380. Email agreed 8 Sep.	**Yes**
N5-030415	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-1 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 381. Email agreed 8 Sep.	**Yes**
N5-030416	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-2 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 382. Email agreed 8 Sep.	**Yes**
N5-030417	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-3 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 383. Email agreed 8 Sep.	**Yes**
N5-030418	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-4 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 384. Email agreed 8 Sep.	**Yes**
N5-030420	Rel-5 CR 29.198-05 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.	**Yes**
N5-030421	Rel-5 CR 29.198-06 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.	**Yes**
N5-030422	Rel-5 CR 29.198-07 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.	**Yes**
N5-030423	Rel-5 CR 29.198-08 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.	**Yes**
N5-030426	Rel-5 CR 29.198-11 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.	**Yes**
N5-030427	Rel-5 CR 29.198-12 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.	**Yes**
N5-030428	Rel-5 CR 29.198-13 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.	**Yes**
N5-030429	Rel-5 CR 29.198-14 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.	**Yes**
N5-030430	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Update Framework with new TpServiceTypeName values	Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 323. Email agreed 8 Aug.	**No**
N5-030431	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Allow for applications to re-obtain the reference to the service manager (Re-submission of Dublin-approved N5-021150)	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 320. Agreed.	**No**
N5-030432	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Add support in OSA to inform applications about new SCSs and their level of Backward compatibility – Alignment with 22.127 (Re-submission of Bangkok-approved N5-030097)	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 321. Agreed.	**No**
N5-030433	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Addition of “Extended User Status” as service type name - Alignment with 29.198-06 (Re-submission of SanDiego-approved N5-030284)	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 322. Agreed.	**No**

B.2 List of CN5-agreed CRs to be submitted to CN#21 for Approval

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-030412	Rel-5 CR 29.198-01 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 379. Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030413	Rel-5 CR 29.198-02 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 379. Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030414	Rel-5 CR 29.198-03 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 380. Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030415	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-1 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 381. Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030416	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-2 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 382. Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030417	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-3 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 383. Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030418	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-4 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 384. Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030420	Rel-5 CR 29.198-05 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030421	Rel-5 CR 29.198-06 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030422	Rel-5 CR 29.198-07 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030423	Rel-5 CR 29.198-08 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030426	Rel-5 CR 29.198-11 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030427	Rel-5 CR 29.198-12 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030428	Rel-5 CR 29.198-13 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.
N5-030429	Rel-5 CR 29.198-14 Java Annex	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Email agreed 8 Sep.

B.3 Liaison Statements

None at this meeting.

Type	Doc	Title	Source	Agenda	Conclusion
LS in					
LS out					

Annex C: Participants list

Chairman

ABARCA Chelo	ALCATEL S.A.	FR

Vice Chairman

UNMEHOPA Musa	Lucent Technologies B.V.	NL

Guest

ATSUSHI Iwasaki	NTT DoCoMo Inc.	JP

BAKKER John-Luc	Telcordia Technologies	US
BUNTING Roger L.	Lucent Technologies	DE
DEKKER René	ERICSSON LM	SE
DINALE Liliana	ERICSSON LM	SE
HUMPHREY Jane D	MARCONI COMMUNICATIONS	GB
MULLIGAN Ultan	ETSI Secretariat	FR
MURRAY Eamonn	AePONA LTD	GB
STRETCH Richard	BT Group Plc	GB
VAN RIJSSEN Erwin	ERICSSON LM	SE
VENKATESH Guda	Teltier Technologies	US

Number of Attendees: **12**

Member of 3GPP (ETSI)

Ms. Chelo Abarca	ALCATEL S.A.	(ETSI)	FR	+33 1307 70469	chelo.abarca@alcatel.fr
Dr. Roger L. Bunting	Lucent Technologies	(ETSI)	US	+1 630 979 5942	rlbunting@lucent.com
Mr. René Dekker	ERICSSON LM	(ETSI)	NL	+31 161242425	rene.dekker@ericsson.com
Mrs. Liliana Dinale	ERICSSON LM	(ETSI)	SE	+1514 345 7900 x 5292	liliana.dinale@ericsson.ca
Ms. Jane D Humphrey	MARCONI COMMUNICATIONS	(ETSI)	GB	+44 24 76564232	jane.humphrey@marconi.com
Mr. Eamonn Murray	AePONA LTD	(ETSI)	GB	+44 28 90269188	eamonn.murray@aepona.com
Mr. Richard Stretch	BT Group Plc	(ETSI)	GB	+44 1473 607487	richard.stretch@bt.com
Mr. Musa Unmehopa	Lucent Technologies B.V.	(ETSI)	NL	+31 35 687 1684	unmehopa@lucent.com
Mr. Erwin van Rijssen	ERICSSON LM	(ETSI)	NL	+31161242320	Erwin.van.Rijssen@ericsson.com
Mr. Guda Venkatesh	Teltier Technologies	(ETSI)	US	+1 732 428 1500	Venk@teltier.com

Member of 3GPP (T1)

Mr. John-Luc Bakker	Telcordia Technologies	(T1)	US	+1 973 829 5062	jbakker@telcordia.com

Member of 3GPP (TTC)

Mr. Iwasaki Atsushi	NTT DoCoMo Inc.	(TTC)	JP	+81-422-59-6649	iwasaki.atsushi@lab.ntt.co.jp

Organisation partner representative (ETSI)

Mr. Ultan Mulligan	ETSI Secretariat	(ETSI)	FR	+33 4 92 94 43 88	ultan.mulligan@etsi.org

History

Document history		
Ver. 1.0.0	14 Aug 2003	N5-030307 DRAFT Report submitted to CN5 for comment and posted at: http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_cn/WG5_osa/TSGN5_24_SanFrancisco/Report/ and http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_cn/WG5_osa/TSGN5_25_Bangkok/Docs/
Ver. 2.0.0	09 Sep 2003	N5-030307r1 Revised DRAFT Report submitted to CN5 for comment and posted at: http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_cn/WG5_osa/TSGN5_24_SanFrancisco/Report/ and http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_cn/WG5_osa/TSGN5_25_Bangkok/Docs/
Ver. 3.0.0	31 Oct 2003	N5-030308: Approved Report at CN5#25 and posted at: http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_cn/WG5_osa/TSGN5_24_SanFrancisco/Report/